

JPRS-UIA-85-021

18 December 1985

USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

18 December 1985

USSR REPORT

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

Ponomarev Urges Efforts for Peace at Friendship Organizations' Meeting (PRAVDA, 27 Sep 85).....	1
--	---

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

International Discussion on 10th Anniversary of Helsinki Conference (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 9, Sep 85).....	6
'Milestone in European History', by I. Torkunov	6
Czech Foreign Minister Chnoupek Comment, by Bohuslav Chnoupek	11
'Basis of Security in Europe', by I. Orlik	15
European Economic Cooperation, by O. Bogomolov	18
'Economic Exchanges: A Factor for Peace', by A. Bykov	22
'The USA and the European Process', by Yu. Daydov	25
'Western Reactionaries Undermine Security', by A. Vakhrameyev	27
'Problems of Military Detente', by N. Kishilov	29
CDE Conference, by V. Sheremetyev	32
European Cultural Contacts, by Yu. Kashlev	35
Mass Media, by Kaarle Nordenstreng	38
'Fidelity to the Final Act', by Ernst-Otto Schwabe	42
'Decisive Factor', by A. Yazkova	44
Hungarian Newspaper Editor Comments, by Jozsef Czaszi	47
Final World From Editors	49
Antidumping Legislation Criticized (Stanislav Otreshko, Alexandr Poluektov; FOREIGN TRADE, No 9, Sep 85).....	52

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

Imperialism's Influence on Developing Nations Attacked (A. Ivanov; POLITICHESKOYE SAMOOBRAZOVANIYE, No 9, Sep 85).....	63
Discussion of 'Solutions' to Debt Problem (Mikhail Burlakov; NEW TIMES, No 41, Oct 85).....	73
Table of Contents: AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 9, 1985 (AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 9, Sep 85).....	81
Review of Journal AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 9, September 1985 (APN DAILY REVIEW, 26 Sep 85).....	83
Future of Soviet-Syrian Relations Seen as Favorable (N. Kanunnikov; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 9, Sep 85).....	86
Roundtable on Revolution, Reform in Liberation Movement (L. Birchanskaya; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 9, Sep 85)...	91
Namibian Provincial Government Discussed (V. Bushin; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 9, Sep 85).....	108
Zionist Colonization of Palestine Scored (Part 3) (D. Prokofyev; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 9, Sep 85).....	113

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Soviet Foreign Trade Statistics: January-June 1985 (FOREIGN TRADE, No 9, Sep 85).....	123
--	-----

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Two Books Assailing U.S. Military-Industrial Complex Reviewed (S. Zabolotskikh; KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL, No 13, Jul 85).....	131
Briefs	
Pierre Trudeau in Baku	137
U.S. Peace Delegates in Tbilisi	137

WESTERN EUROPE

Unprecedented Foreign Policy Differences Cause Italian Crisis (Various sources, various dates).....	138
Considerable Stress in Various Circles, by M. Ilinskiy	138
Crisis Provoked by U.S., by V. Solomin	139
Totally Unusual Situation, by G. Zafesov	141

Briefs

Greek-Soviet Society Members in Alma-Ata	144
Dutch Journalists in Alma-Ata	144
Trade Union Delegation in Armenia	144

EASTERN EUROPE

Bulgaria: Scientific, Technological Progress Praised (B. Panov; EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, No 36, Sep 85).....	145
--	-----

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Latin American Regimes, Economies Hit (V. Laptev; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 10 Sep 85).....	149
Pinochet's Position 'Deteriorating' (Igor Rybalkin; NEW TIMES, No 41, Oct 85).....	153

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

Mounting Protests in ROK Noted (Sergey Tikhomirov; PRAVDA, 1 Oct 85).....	157
--	-----

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

Briefs

Indian Youth Delegates Visit Tashkent	159
---------------------------------------	-----

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

USSR-Angola Agreement on Scientific, Cultural Exchanges (SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SOYUZA SOVETSKIKH SOTSIALISTI-CHESKIKH RESPUBLIK, No 12, 1985).....	160
Economic Assistance to Mozambique (Vankarem Zhdankin; FOREIGN TRADE, No 9, Sep 85).....	168

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

PONOMAREV URGES EFFORTS FOR PEACE AT FRIENDSHIP ORGANIZATIONS' MEETING

PM011307 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 85 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "For Friendship Between Peoples"]

[Text] The movement for friendship between peoples has become an important component of the joint struggle by peace-loving forces against the threat of war. In our country it has taken on the nature of a genuine mass movement.

This was stressed in Moscow 26 September at a ceremonial meeting of the Soviet public devoted to the 60th anniversary of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries (SSOD). Taking part were activists of Soviet friendship organizations, the leaders of societies for friendship with the Soviet Union, and representatives of other foreign organizations with which the SSOD maintains contacts.

B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who delivered a speech noted that the appearance of the first working people's state in the international arena as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution was a turning point in world development and led to radical shifts in international relations. Since the moment of its birth the Land of the Soviets has been the creator of a new foreign policy, a policy aimed at the attainment of a just, lasting peace, peaceful coexistence and cooperation between states, and international solidarity with the peoples' struggle for national and social liberation. This policy is directed toward the people's masses, and since the very first steps to implement it, it has met with understanding and support among progressive circles of the international public.

The heroic struggle of our country's working people to assert the ideals of free, creative labor, peace, and friendship between peoples called into being a wave of sympathies and solidarity throughout the world, a wave which became the movement which went down in history under the slogan "Hands Off Soviet Russia" and which subsequently set itself the goal of actively promoting the efforts of Soviet power along the path of its diplomatic recognition. It was on this firm basis that the movement of the Soviet and foreign public for friendship and mutual understanding between peoples emerged.

A long and glorious path has been traveled in 60 years. It is the path from the first little cells of the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries to a movement which is truly nationwide and in which millions of Soviet people take part, including representatives of all our motherland's nations and nationalities. They are putting into practice the provision of the USSR Constitution that "it is the international duty of a citizen of the USSR to promote the development of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of other countries and the maintenance and strengthening of universal peace."

The SSOD has become a mass public organization which enjoys well earned respect both within the country and elsewhere. But all that has been said does not mean that the limit has been reached in this matter and that we can rest on our laurels. It is necessary more actively to utilize the inexhaustible potential for the development of international cooperation.

This potential, the speaker stressed, is inherent in the magnetic force of socialism which has as its fundamental values freedom from exploitation and from social and national oppression, the rights--guaranteed materially and legislatively--to labor, health care, and housing, free access to education and tomorrow, confidence in the future, and true people's power.

This potential is inherent in the foreign policy line of the CPSU and the Soviet state, a line which meets the peoples' deepest interests and which is based on the struggle for mankind's peaceful future, for the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, for the development of constructive cooperation on the basis of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems and for the elimination of all forms of discrimination in international relations.

This potential is inherent in the ever increasing activeness of Soviet people, who wholeheartedly support the CPSU's policy, and in their boundless willingness to devote their strength and knowledge to the strengthening of peace and friendship between peoples.

This potential is inherent finally, in the existence abroad of very many millions of selfless friends of our country. We can note with satisfaction that their ranks are constantly increasing. The existence and growth in the number of societies for friendship with the world's first socialist country are irrefutable evidence of the growth in its international prestige from year to year and an indication of the foreign public's ever increasing desire to establish friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

Soviet friendship societies must continue actively to promote the development of contacts with corresponding organizations in foreign countries and support in every way their efforts to strengthen cooperation and friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries.

In the conditions of the serious exacerbation of the international situation it is important to make millions of people in the world aware of the meaning and significance of the Soviet state's foreign policy, which are to revive the detente process and achieve a transition from a world packed with weapons to a reliable, all-embracing system of international security. The attainment of this goal is the aim of the numerous major peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union. These include such steps on the Soviet Union's part as the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and the imposition in 1983 of a moratorium on placing antisatellite weapons in space. The world public greeted with tremendous approval the USSR's decision unilaterally to stop all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985 and the USSR's detailed proposals on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of nonmilitarization.

If these and other Soviet initiatives were implemented, he said, mankind would be delivered from the threat of nuclear destruction and would have a tremendous sign of relief.

CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's replies to America's TIME magazine once again set forth extremely clearly the Soviet stance on vital issues in world politics and reaffirmed the Soviet Union's desire for unprejudiced dialogue with our partners.

However, the Soviet Union's good will is not enough on its own. What is needed is reciprocity on the part of the United States and its NATO allies. But in American ruling circles there are still strong hopes of achieving a dominant position in the world, and above all military superiority. The world public must be well aware of this and must have a clear idea of who is the true culprit to blame for the whipping up of tension in the world.

It is important for the efforts undertaken at state level for the relaxation of tension to be backed up and based on the moral authority of world public opinion and the energetic actions of the peace-loving public.

The Soviet people face tremendous, large-scale tasks to accelerate socioeconomic development and improve the socialist society, tasks which are oriented toward peaceful construction in the long term. The forthcoming 27th congress of the Communist Party, for which all Communists and all our people are preparing, will be an important milestone in the country's development. The congress will adopt a new edition of the party program which is oriented toward the future, the 21st century. All this is clear evidence that we are firmly following the Leninist path of peace and peaceful coexistence, and that the Soviet "military threat" which they shout about in the West does not and cannot exist.

Preserving peace is our country's most important goal, B.N. Ponomarev said in conclusion. This was once again convincingly stated in the Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and

USSR Council of Ministers "To the Peoples, Parliaments, and Governments of All Countries," adopted to mark the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, which called on them to heed the voice of reason and by active, joint efforts to halt the slide into the abyss of nuclear catastrophe, bar the path to a new war, and achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

B.N. Ponomarev then read out the text of the CPSU Central Committee message of greetings to the participants in the ceremonial meeting. It was greeted by prolonged applause.

A report on "the Movement for Friendship With the Peoples of Foreign Countries--an Important Factor in the Struggle for Peace, Mutual Understanding, and Trust" was delivered by Z.M. Kruglova, chairman of the SSOD presidium. She recalled that in 1925 the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries--the SSOD's predecessor--was formed in the Soviet Union on a voluntary basis. The main purpose and aim of its activity was to create an atmosphere favorable to the development of cooperation between states, an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding between people speaking different languages.

The movement of the Soviet and foreign public for the development of friendship and cultural cooperation, the speaker said, emerged as a result of the victory of Great October, which, with Lenin's Decree on Peace, proclaimed a fundamentally new era in relations between countries and peoples. From the first days of its activity Soviet Russia supported the broad international exchange of spiritual and cultural wealth, regarding it as not only a means of strengthening trust, but an objective process of international intercourse.

The system of friendship organizations which has now been created in the USSR has provided the opportunity to hold some 60,000 events annually, which give the Soviet public a wide acquaintanceship with the contemporary life and culture of other peoples and promote the international education of Soviet people. This system promotes the successful implementation of broad ties between the SSOD and 10,000 foreign public, state, cultural enlightenment, and scientific organizations and associations, political parties, local self-government bodies, universities, and other educational establishments, as well as state and public figures and representatives of science and culture in more than 140 countries.

In connection with the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress, the SSOD regards it as its main task to inform the foreign public widely about the CPSU's domestic policy and activity, which are aimed at improving people's material and spiritual life, are permeated by creative ideas, and are oriented toward lofty humanitarian goals. Together with foreign friendship societies we will continue to spread widely the trust about the Soviet way of life, the impressive plans for improving real socialism, and the fact that these plans and programs are directed only toward

peaceful construction, and by virtue of this fact in itself are incompatible with any aggressive, bellicose intentions such as those ascribed to the Soviet Union by imperialist propaganda.

The Soviet public expresses profound gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee for its high assessment of the SSOD's work and its great attentiveness and all-around assistance in its activity.

In the speeches by Hero of Socialist Labor Yu.K. Sidorov, member of the presidium of the Leningrad section of the SSOD and lathe operator at the Elektrosila association; S.A. Shelest, member of the board of the Lvov Oblast section of the USSR-Canada society and machine operator at the Chapayev Kolkhoz; and Hero of Socialist Labor and People's Artist of the USSR S.A. Gerasimov, president of the SSOD association of cinema personalities and movie director, it was stressed that the ideas of peace are clear and precious to all Soviet people. The working people of the Land of the Soviets live and work for the sake of a peaceful future for their children and grandchildren. It was noted that the same problems--making life happier, and peace more lasting and just--agitate working people all over the planet. This commonality gives rise to the desire for friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation among peoples.

The speakers described their organizations' practical work in strengthening ties between the Soviet and foreign public.

Greetings to the SSOD were delivered from the platform by A. Apro, chairman of the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society; V.R. Krishna (Ayyer), member of the presidential council of the Indian-Soviet Cultural Society; and M. Gilbert, executive president of the France-USSR Society. They gave a high assessment of the activity of the SSOD, which has earned broad international prestige. It was noted that the deepening of ties between the Soviet Union's peoples and the peoples of other countries has exerted and continues to exert a beneficial influence on the entire world climate.

The participants in the meeting enthusiastically adopted a letter of greetings to the CPSU Central Committee.

Present at the meeting were leaders of a number of ministries and departments, representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations, and personalities from science and culture. The heads of the diplomatic missions of a number of foreign countries accredited to the USSR were present.

The leaders and activists of SSOD organizations and foreign guests who had come to Moscow for the SSOD jubilee visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. A wreath was also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier near the Kremlin Wall.

/9738

CSO: 1807/112

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

INTERNATIONAL DISCUSSION ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HELSINKI CONFERENCE

'Milestone in European History'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 70-76

[August 1, 1985 saw the 10th anniversary of the conclusion, in the Finnish capital, of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which marked a decisive turn towards European detente. On the occasion of the anniversary International Affairs has organised an exchange of opinions. Taking part were Soviet and foreign statesmen and political figures, international affairs scholars from several Soviet research centers, including the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, the Institute of the United States and Canada, the Institute of World Economy and Politics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, as well as practical workers and journalists. The contributors to the discussion looked at the sources and development of international detente in Europe, at the substance and significance of the Conference documents, assessed the results of the decade since the Conference and the positive changes achieved in this period along with the obstacles and difficulties the CSCE process has encountered largely through the fault of the present U.S. administration. Prospects of international development in Europe were also discussed. Below are the contributions to the discussion.]

[Article by Prof L. Torkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, president of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation]

[Text]

The Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was an event of epoch-making significance. It summed up the political results of the Second World War and of postwar development and mapped out the long-range guidelines for the efforts of states to turn Europe into a continent of lasting peace and mutually beneficial cooperation. The Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the Council of Ministers of the USSR have noted in their Appeal "To the Peoples, Parliaments and Governments of All Countries on the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War" that the participants in the Conference signed the Helsinki Final Act outlining ways to "overcome confrontation stemming from the character of their relations in the past and to better mutual understanding". By collective efforts the states laid down the foundations of detente which has "demonstrated its indubitable advantages and benefits for everyone".

Coincidence of historical dates are often revealing. This is true of

such dates as the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki Conference and the anniversary of Victory over Nazi Germany and militarist Japan. Victory opened a new page in the history of mankind, marking the triumph of the forces of peace and progress over the forces of reaction and obscurantism. We celebrate the 40th anniversary of victory mainly in order to remind people of the chief lessons and conclusions of the past tragedy so as to prevent a new and more terrible tragedy of thermonuclear war.

The chief lesson of the past war therefore is that war must be averted before it begins, and this must be done not single handedly but together, upholding peace by concerted and vigorous actions of all the peace forces.

This is the underlying idea of the Helsinki accords, the Final Act of the Conference. It fully corresponds to the general line and the bedrock principles of the Soviet foreign policy.

Try as they may, the falsifiers of history will never be able to conceal the fact that in the prewar years the Soviet Union was the first to warn the nations of the impending danger. In the 1930s, it made persistent proposals to create a system of collective security in Europe that would erect a solid barrier in the way of Hitler's aggression. If the West had responded to the Soviet proposals war could have been averted. However, the Western leaders of the time were blinded by hatred of socialism. For the aggressors had united long before the war. The Berlin-Rome Axis and the alliance between Germany and Japan took shape in 1936. The remaining countries of Europe, however, failed to unite to collectively resist the invaders and rejected the Soviet proposal on a security system. The political right wing in the Western countries hoped until the last to come to terms with Hitler and to channel the German war machine against the USSR. They were entranced by the speeches of the fascist chieftains fulminating against international communism and calling for an all-out war against it. Very soon they had to pay for their short-sightedness. France was routed. Britain was on the brink of an abyss. The Japanese militarists' strike on Pearl Harbor and massive expansion in the Pacific and Southeast Asia threatened the vital interests of the USA. The anti-Hitler alliance was born only after the flames of war had engulfed the whole world.

This suggests the conclusion that spreading the struggle of ideas to the relations between states means to impede a constructive solution of international problems and to erect obstacles in the way of stronger peace.

The victorious war against fascist aggression demonstrated the invincibility of socialism, the immense advantages of the Soviet state and economic system, the great potential of the socialist state's military organisation and the might of its armed forces.

Simultaneously the destinies of many peoples and states of Europe which faced destruction by the Nazi thugs were decided in those years. In the final analysis the destinies of the whole world were decided. That is why victory over Nazism in the Second World War, its results and lessons are not only the past but also the present and future of the human race. They are organically linked with the current struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, a struggle that is of vital significance for all nations. Millions of people reflecting over the past single out this as a major lesson of the Second World War: the conviction that it was possible and necessary for states with different social systems to come out jointly against aggression and for peace.

This conclusion underlies the consistent peaceful policy the Soviet Union has pursued in the world over the postwar decades. Peaceful endeavour and peace are the main directions that determine the essence of the multi-faceted activities of the CPSU and the USSR. The Soviet state's titanic efforts have played the decisive role in the preservation of peace

on earth, led to dramatic positive changes in international life and contributed to the initiation and strengthening of the process of detente. One of the invaluable results of these efforts was the convening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

We can rightly be proud of the fact that the initiative of the socialist countries was decisive in that. It was thanks to this initiative that the European continent, which had lived through the tragedy of two world wars, managed to achieve the most tangible results in promoting peaceful coexistence, detente, and cooperation and goodneighbourly relations between countries with different social systems. This is a priceless asset, a heritage of the whole international community.

The Final Act adopted at the Conference embodied all the positive experience amassed by the peoples of Europe during and after the Second World War and in the cold war period. It reflected the political will to improve and step up relations between states with different social systems. The adoption of that document was a measure of the continuity of political trends in Europe and in the world initiated as a result of the Second World War.

Detente had deep political roots going as far back as the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam which were effectively reaffirmed in Helsinki in 1975. These decisions were aimed at ensuring the cooperation of all European states in achieving common goals — preventing aggression, establishing a lasting peace on the continent and mutually beneficial cooperation among its nations.

The participants in the Helsinki forum agreed to follow the principles that guarantee durable peace and reliable security, the principles that are capable of strengthening security and cooperation, eliminating tensions threatening to erupt into an open conflict, and promoting normal relations between states.

The Conference has revealed a vast area of mutual understanding between states with different social systems in many political fields and above all the understanding that there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence, understanding of the need for cooperation among states, for observing the principles on which the peaceful fabric of Europe should be based.

The results achieved after the Helsinki Conference gave the European peoples profound faith in the CSCE process whose meaning consists in deepening detente, strengthening security and expanding interaction between states and peoples. There is a massive body of facts to prove that the Helsinki accords were realistic.

The 1970s saw more active political cooperation in bilateral relations on the European continent. Regular consultations became common practice. A wide range of important bilateral documents were signed and came into force. East-West summit meetings exerted a favourable impact on the political climate in Europe. Review conferences were held in Belgrade and Madrid and a conference is currently being held in Stockholm. The Conference revived activities in the field of military detente.

The past decade has dramatically proved that economic cooperation is the material fabric of detente. From 1975 to 1983 trade between the West European countries and the European CMEA countries increased by almost 80 per cent to just under \$74,000 million. New forms of cooperation were initiated (notably, the compensation, or "buy-back" deals), and links in the scientific, technological and environmental protection fields became stronger. Cooperation in the humanitarian and other areas assumed wide scope.

In short, the decade since the Helsinki Conference has accumulated valuable experience in the interaction between states on the European level in various fields. The Soviet Union favours an even and balanced

development of detente in all the three main directions - political, economic, and scientific and technological - as well as humanitarian, stressing that success is hardly possible without political will and confidence.

At the same time these ten years have revealed two parallel processes in European and world politics. The first is the continuation of the "Helsinki spirit", realisation of the Final Act provisions, and the further broadening of European political, economic and cultural ties. Advance along that road was fairly rapid until the early 1980s but it subsequently slowed down. However, it still continues and involves the majority of European states. There is logic in that, for it is necessary to come to terms on matters of strengthening the atmosphere of constructive political cooperation, promoting confidence, i. e. everything that deals with the normalisation of relations and improvement of the political atmosphere as a whole.

Today, mankind possesses a huge potential of peace, experience in various fields, and historical and social vision sufficient to realise where the policy of aggression can lead to. This cements the forces of peace, augments anti-war movements, inspires ever new progressive, democratic sections of the world public to the struggle against the threat of war.

Contrary to all the attempts by the militarists to bury detente, its achievements are alive not only in the memory of peoples but in the day-to-day realities of the European continent. The political and legal foundations of detente and its material results are so tangible that it can be said with confidence that this course in world politics has deep roots, enjoys powerful backing and has every chance of remaining the leading trend in international relations in the 1980s and in the longer perspective.

The time has apparently come to take into account the needs of the moment and the experience of Europe and consider a general comprehensive approach to the problem of security in Asia and possible concerted efforts of Asian states in that direction. This is, to be sure, a formidable challenge. But then, neither was the road to Helsinki smooth and even. Various methods could be applied: bilateral negotiations and multilateral consultations culminating perhaps in an all-Asia forum to exchange opinions and explore constructive solutions together.

Summing up the results of the past decade the Soviet scholars in their report "Ten Years of the CSCE Process of Strengthening Security and Developing Cooperation in Europe: Results and Perspectives", prepared jointly with the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, note that on the whole these results have undoubtedly been favourable and positive. First, the objective interest of an overwhelming majority of the Conference participants in the continuance of the CSCE process has been confirmed. Second, even the departures from the ten principles agreed in Helsinki merely underlined their intransigent significance as a code of norms whose observance is necessary for mutually beneficial peaceful cooperation in Europe. Third, full observance of the principles of the Final Act can provide a reliable way to eliminate tensions in international relations.

Simultaneously, the study stresses that international relations would not automatically develop in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence. The sides must exert constant efforts to revive the atmosphere of honest search for agreements and mutually acceptable modes of settling conflicts on the basis of respect for and strict observance of the principles enshrined in the Final Act. As for the USSR, in the past ten years it has, at all international meetings, invariably urged the need to consolidate the political results of the European Conference seeking the inclusion of commitments to fulfil the Helsinki accords in final documents, agreements and communiqués of these meetings.

It would, however, be a dangerous delusion not to see the other process initiated by the right-wing circles in the USA in the late 1970s and

early 1980s to dilute the positive results of the Conference. Although this policy is to varying degree backed by some European NATO states, there is no unanimity in the West on a number of key aspects of the CSCE process. Many West European countries simultaneously take part in the realisation of the Helsinki accords and impede that realisation with some of their actions. As a result, we are marking the tenth anniversary of the Final Act in a complex and tense international situation. The deployment of American first-strike missiles in some NATO countries dramatically worsened the situation on the continent, burdening the relations between European states and erecting serious obstacles in the way of the continued CSCE process. The situation is aggravated by the desire of the USA to involve its West European allies in the adventurist "star wars" plans.

One may well ask: has the security of West European countries increased with the deployment of American nuclear missiles? On the contrary, their security has decreased. It is self-evident that Washington's doctrine envisages possible nuclear strikes within the geographical confines of Europe, and Europe alone. The USA sees this as an additional chance of victory. The destinies of Western Europe are made conditional on any miscalculation and any, even a technical, error. Most important, these destinies are dependent on the selfish calculations of the USA which is ready to sacrifice its Western partners. It is obvious that the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe, like the so-called "strategic defense initiative" envisaging the militarisation of outer space, makes it technically more feasible to risk a nuclear confrontation, thus fostering the illusion that victory in a nuclear showdown could be achieved with the help of new monstrous weaponry.

The forces advocating this kind of plans and programmes do not want to reconcile themselves to the existence of a different, opposite social system. They still think of "rolling back" communism and restoring their order in the whole world. Proceeding from this dangerous and fallacious philosophy of world hegemony, these forces - notably the present Washington Administration - and its allies are stepping up the arms race, turning Europe into an arena of rivalry in building up means of destruction. This is our assessment of the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe, the beefing up of the NATO military machine and the preparations for a first disarming strike at the socialist countries.

These moves are aimed at upsetting the balance of forces between East and West and are fundamentally at odds with the key requirements of the Final Act, in particular, its basic provisions concerning the preservation and strengthening of European security and heightening of trust. The quest of military superiority and a possibility to dictate one's will to others runs counter to the Helsinki accords and erects barriers in the way of the CSCE process.

It is not accidental that in the present situation forces have been more active in the ERG, that call in question the territorial and political realities in Europe, and seek a revision of the state frontiers of some countries in utter contradiction to the ideas, principles and provisions of the Final Act which declares the inviolability of frontiers.

Moreover, there are those who cynically try to use the Final Act to conceal attempts to bring about a revision of European borders. This trend is discernible, for example, in the joint statement of the US President and the West German Chancellor of November 30, 1984, which reads in part: "Committed to the Helsinki Final Act... we do not accept the division of Europe as permanent and shall work to lower the human costs of the tragic barrier, which divides the continent, and in particular, the German people."

The situation in Europe was undoubtedly influenced by the overall dangerous tilt in Washington's policy towards renouncing the principle of peaceful coexistence and its line for confrontation with the countries belonging to the other social system. Everyone realises that all the positive achievements in Europe and the rest of the world in the postwar years could be cancelled out unless the nuclear missile race is curbed. The USA is carrying out gigantic armaments programmes, launching serial production of Trident and MX missiles, B-1 and Stealth bombers, submarines and new aircraft carriers. Washington has decided to shift the arms race to outer space, which would dramatically increase the danger of a nuclear war. There is broad public understanding of this in the world. For example, the Finnish Prime Minister, Kalevi Sorsa, during his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev and speaking on behalf of the Consultative Council on Disarmament of the Socialist International, opposed the militarisation of outer space and pronounced himself in favour of fresh efforts not only to limit the arms race, but to stop it. The Soviet Union is totally supportive of this stand.

It is the duty of all the peace forces to stop mankind's slide towards the abyss of a nuclear conflict. This is the objective of the Soviet efforts. We are driven by the memory of the millions of dead and are concerned for the present and future generations. It was on our initiative that Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear weapons began in Geneva.

We propose a radical solution to the problem - to ban these weapons, to eliminate a whole class of space strike weapons, including anti-satellite and anti-missile space-based systems and any systems whether based on land, in the air, or at sea - designed to strike at space objects. The Soviet stand has received broad support at the United Nations.

This is not surprising. The world community is aware of the dire consequences of the militarisation of outer space which would undermine the process of arms limitation and reduction and impart a fresh impetus to the arms race, exacerbate competition in the building up of the already colossal military expenditures, and would increase the threat of intentional or unsanctioned or accidental start of a nuclear war.

It has to be admitted, however, that the first rounds of the Geneva talks give cause for concern because the United States is using every kind of pretext to sidestep the initial agreement to consider all three components - space weapons, strategic weapons, and medium-range nuclear weapons together in their organic interconnection. It is doing everything possible to secure the adoption of the programme of the so-called strategic defence initiative and seeks to use the talks as a smokescreen for its plans of taking the arms race into outer space. Moreover, the USA is trying to get its European NATO allies involved in these dangerous plans. This could undermine the very foundations of European security, make our continent a field of nuclear conflict, which could be unleashed by extremist forces in the USA if they come to believe in the credibility of their "space shield". "Western European leaders," writes *Newsweek* magazine, "have never been particularly enthusiastic about Ronald Reagan's Star Wars plan". Most of them believe it "will hinder arms talks" and has created "profound and unresolved disagreements among key European leaders".

Yet even today, when the world situation has become more tense, the socialist countries are convinced that the peoples of Europe have the possibility to restore stability and security on the European land and drastically reduce the level of military confrontation, to turn the continent's development towards constructive, mutually beneficial cooperation between states with different social systems. A real perspective for such a turn is opened up by the initiatives of the socialist countries put forward individually and collectively.

The realization of the Soviet proposal on a mutual and comprehensive moratorium on the development and deployment of nuclear and space weapons would undoubtedly contribute to the success in that field. As regards Europe, the Soviet Union, in another demonstration of its good will, from April 7 to November 1985 introduced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium range missiles and suspended other retaliatory measures in Europe. The USSR calls for taking effective steps to completely rid the European continent of nuclear weapons, both medium range and tactical. Europe must also be free of chemical weapons. Peace and security in Europe would be furthered by the creation of nuclear-free zones in the Balkans, in the north of Europe, and in other parts of the continent, and by a non-increase and reductions in military expenditure.

All the peoples of the world now face a common enemy, the threat of nuclear war, and their main task is to eliminate that threat. Is it a feasible task? The Soviet people have no doubt on that score. Yes, the military threat to the world created by the adventurist imperialist circles can be averted.

The Soviet Union declares again and again that it will firmly follow the Leninist course of peace and peaceful coexistence determined by its social system, its ethics and world view. This country is in favour of smooth, proper and civilized relations between states, based on genuine respect of international law.

"The concept of detente," stressed Mikhail Gorbachev, "was born in Europe. It will soon be ten years since the day the historic document was signed in Helsinki, which summed up, as it were, everything the peoples associate with this meaningful word. Much of what has been built on that basis has been destroyed by the icy winds from across the Atlantic, but much has stood its ground, survived and struck deep root and is bringing tangible benefits to the peoples."

These words provide a profound and accurate assessment of the results of the ten years since the historic forum in Helsinki. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries do not only want to revive the spirit, atmosphere and essence of detente. They are ready to go further towards a reliable system of international law and security.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English Translation Progress Publishers 1985**

Czech Foreign Minister Chnoupek Comment

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 76-79

[Article by Bohuslav Chnoupek, minister of foreign affairs]

[Text]

The document which was signed by the leaders of 33 European countries, the USA and Canada ten years ago has undoubtedly become a symbol of a new stage in the life of peoples on every continent. The Final Act encapsulated the universal will of the world's peoples to say a firm "Yes!" to cooperation in the political, economic and cultural spheres based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. It was also a decisive "No!" to wars, tension and mistrust between states and entire alliances of states.

For the first time in history Europe received a historic opportunity to create realistic conditions for peace, security and cooperation among states, despite the differences existing between them in politics, economy,

the social field and philosophical views. An understanding of the possibility and need for living without the threat of war emanated not only from the practical needs of modern Europe, but also from the prospects for its development and the development of the other continents on the planet.

The most important result of the Conference in Helsinki is the fact that fundamental principles of relations among the European states based on the inviolability of European borders and political realities were formulated and affirmed there. It is very important that all the participants unanimously agreed with this, which reflects the wish of the peoples of our continent to live in peace and security.

The road to this agreement, however, was complicated and long. Representatives of ruling circles in the West had to be convinced that the socialist countries could not be dealt with from positions of strength, and that their high prestige in the international arena had to be recognised. The adherence to principle and persistence of the socialist countries in pursuing a peaceable policy found increasing understanding among the West European public and realistically minded politicians in the capitalist countries. The results of the improvement of the political climate in Europe in the 1960s and 1970s made themselves felt, too, as did the positive turn which took place in Soviet-American relations. The treaties between the USSR, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia with the FRG, as well as the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin were also an important prerequisite for the success of the Helsinki Conference.

Proceeding from our own experience and the experience of other countries, we can say that today the achievements scored during detente of the 1970s have not been forgotten. And this despite the fact that the reactionary circles of the imperialist states with their attempts to upset the military-strategic balance (which is a direct contradiction of the letter and spirit of Helsinki) went far in complicating and worsening the international situation. Detente brought many benefits to all the signatories to the Final Act.

After the ten years that have elapsed the signed documents are as significant as ever. This applies above all to the Final Act. Let us recall the great topicality and long-term importance of its main part - the Declaration of Principles which the participants must be guided by in their mutual relations. The common political will of the Helsinki participants is reflected here, namely, to direct efforts to render detente constant, viable, extensive and universal.

At issue are the ten principles whose structure, order and name truly reflect and symbolise the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. After all, it is such principles as sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty, refraining from the threat or use of force, inviolability of borders, territorial integrity of states, peaceful settlement of disputes, and non-interference in internal affairs that constitute the most basic elements without whose implementation not a single area of international relations can be developed.

Also at issue is the Helsinki appeal to supplement political detente with military detente and to explore ways of reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. This is extremely important, inasmuch as it is such a concretisation of detente that should become the underpinning of its long duration and irreversibility in Europe and the rest of the world. We believe it to be a matter of top priority to eliminate the danger of nuclear war, bridle the arms race and attain tangible results towards disarmament.

Worthy of emulation in this regard are the tremendous efforts made by the Soviet Union, which is approaching the new Soviet-American talks in Geneva firmly determined to conduct constructive negotiations on the prevention of the militarisation of outer space and a radical reduction in

strategic and medium range weapons. The USSR has backed up this resolve and desire to reach an accord with concrete actions, which were set forth in an interview given by Mikhail Gorbachev to the newspaper *Pravda* and which generated positive repercussions in the world. We would like to believe that the American Administration will reconsider its present non-constructive stand and give a positive response to this Soviet initiative. This would also have a favourable influence on the development of detente in Europe.

As to the role which Czechoslovakia has been playing in the implementation of the Final Act, we can speak of the high profitability of what has been invested and what has been received. The fact is that thanks to detente Czechoslovakia has been able to normalise relations with its neighbours - the FRG and Austria. Thanks to the constructive framework of detente Czechoslovakia has been able not only to deepen the existing mutually beneficial cooperation with France but even establish more stable and multifarious relations with a number of capitalist countries with which they had been frozen or non-existent altogether since the Second World War, such as Finland, Greece, Denmark, Norway, Turkey and Italy, let alone Portugal and Spain. We have achieved satisfactory and good results in our relations with virtually all the countries that signed the Final Act, and have thus gone far to preserve detente.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has also consistently implemented other provisions dealing with cooperation in the economy, science and technology and environmental protection. It has been providing all the requisite conditions for realising them. A number of bilateral and multilateral treaties have been concluded for the purpose. Just a few of the bilateral ones are the treaties on trade, and economic and scientific and technological cooperation with the FRG, Austria, Portugal, Malta, Iceland, Cyprus, Spain, Luxembourg, France and Holland.

Thirty five working groups are functioning on their basis. Czechoslovakia fully supports the efforts to reduce tensions by eliminating trade barriers and is working towards the effective trade talks and closer contacts between firms at all stages of trade exchange. It is providing the prerequisites for the opening and activity of trade offices of foreign companies in Czechoslovakia, of which there are now 45; it is circulating trade information and creating conditions for the involvement of small and medium foreign enterprises in trade cooperation.

Czechoslovakia is also consistently contributing to cooperation in the humanitarian and other fields ranging from contacts between people to collaboration and exchange in the field of education. Suffice it to examine the facts for each objective person to admit that this country has a positive balance in this sphere. Whereas, for example, in 1975 Czechoslovakia had treaties on cultural cooperation with 44, and on cooperation in health care with 15 countries, in 1985 the figures are 86 and 33 respectively. Every day 28 Czechoslovak cultural figures appear on stages around the world. Whereas in the late 1970s the overall number of researchers (foreigners coming to this country and Czechoslovak researchers going abroad) stood at some 6,000 per year, in 1983 there were already 7,124. Czechoslovakia produces a large number of translated literature of Western authors - approximately one-fourth of the overall printing output, which amounts to 5 million copies. At the same time, works by Czech and Slovak authors appear only sporadically in the West. Similar trends are observed in the press. Czechoslovakia receives 7,100 titles, or over 700,000 copies of newspapers and magazines from capitalist countries.

In conclusion it can be stated that Czechoslovakia is successfully implementing the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference to the full and has all the prerequisites - especially good political will - to continue effectively furthering the implementation of the pledges taken at Helsinki

to strengthen peace and security and uphold the basic rights and the economic and social progress of all peoples. For this reason, in connection with the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki Conference, we believe, it would be useful for the states signatories to the Final Act to express anew in Helsinki a desire and readiness to surmount the existing dangerous tensions in international relations and to further develop peaceful cooperation and all constructive principles in international affairs.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

'Basis of Security in Europe'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 79-81

[Article by Prof I. Orlik, D. Sc. (Hist.), deputy director, Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

The principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems was advanced and theoretically substantiated by Lenin, who foresaw as a historical inevitability the strengthening and growth of socialism and the emergence of new socialist countries, and consequently, the inevitability of elaborating the principles of their relations with capitalist states. Dwelling on this point, Lenin pointed out that in deciding matters of international politics there should be "the greatest possible number of the simplest and most obvious decisions and measures that would certainly lead to peace".¹

After the Second World War the socialist community countries began an energetic struggle to ensure peaceful conditions for the building of socialism. The large-scale programme aimed at achieving a constructive settlement of European problems was set forth in the Declaration on Strengthening Peace and Security in Europe adopted by the Warsaw Treaty member countries at the meeting in Bucharest in July 1966. It is common knowledge that at the Bucharest meeting the socialist countries tabled a proposal to convene a European Conference on security and cooperation on the continent and outlined the main ways of settling this problem.

The subsequent elaboration and coordination of principles of European security were carried out in an atmosphere of acute struggle. The standpoint taken by the socialist countries that the system of collective security was the only possible guarantee of peaceful development for all European states was obstructed for a long time by imperialism with its power politics.

The Western countries' idea of European "security" was based on the alleged possibility of safeguarding security for one part of the European continent at the expense of the other, i. e. security for capitalist countries at the expense of security for socialist countries. The record, however, has shown that attempts to settle the European issues with disre-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, p. 386.

gard for the interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries lack prospects. This eventually came to be recognized in the West by all who were capable of realistically appraising the world situation.

The result was that several capitalist countries began to show a growing tendency in their policy to abandon the highly aggressive line with regard to the socialist countries.

The emergence of such a tendency in the mid-1960s and its development in the 1970s did not mean that the imperialist bourgeoisie had reconciled itself to the existence of socialism. Simply the new world situation induced the more far-sighted representatives of the Western ruling circles to take a relatively sober-minded approach in their appraisal of the correlation of world forces and begin a dialogue with the socialist countries on security and cooperation in Europe.

An important contribution to the elaboration of a comprehensive and constructive programme of European cooperation was made by the Soviet Union. As emphasised in the resolution of the 24th CPSU Congress, "One of the key problems in strengthening world peace and easing tensions is to ensure European security on the basis of recognition of the territorial and political realities that have taken shape as a result of the Second World War". The CPSU pointed to the need for making a radical shift to detente and peace in Europe and ensuring the convocation and success of the European Conference as a vital task of fighting for peace.

The long struggle of the European socialist countries for peace in Europe culminated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe held in 1975. During preparations for the Conference extensive constructive work was carried out to coordinate and establish the principles of security and cooperation in Europe. The Soviet Union worked out a draft of the General Declaration on the Fundamentals of European Security and Principles Guiding Relations Between European States whose many provisions were incorporated into the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

Highly significant was the affirmation in the Final Act of the fundamental principles of European security which the states participants in the Conference pledged to observe in their mutual relations, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems, as well as of their size, geographical location or level of economic development.

The principle of sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty envisages the right of every State to juridical equality, territorial integrity, freedom and political independence, the right freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems and the right to determine its laws and regulations.

Elaborating on the essence of the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force the Final Act declares that the participating States will refrain in their mutual relations, as well as in their international relations in general, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

The participating States formulated the principle of inviolability of all European frontiers and pledged to regard as inviolable all one another's frontiers as well as the frontiers of all States in Europe and refrain now and in the future from assaulting these frontiers.

Noting the need to respect the territorial integrity of States the participants in the Conference declared that they "will refrain from any action inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations against the territorial integrity, political independence or the unity of any participating State, and in particular from any such action constituting a threat or use of force".

The Final Act maintains that all States will resolve all their disputes on the basis of peaceful settlement. They will endeavour in good faith and

a spirit of cooperation to reach a rapid and equitable solution on the basis of international law. For this purpose the participating States will use such means as negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement or other peaceful means of their own choice, including any settlement procedure agreed to in advance of disputes.

The Final Act incorporates the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs of other States under which the participating States undertook to refrain "from any form of armed intervention or threat of such intervention against another participating State", as well as "from any other act of military, or of political, economic or other coercion designed to subordinate to their own interest the exercise by another participating State of the rights inherent in its sovereignty and thus to secure advantages of any kind".

The participating States proclaimed the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief stating their intention to "promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development". They recognised the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves as among all States.

The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples emphasises that "all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development".

As regards the principle of cooperation among States, the Final Act notes that the participating States will endeavour in developing their cooperation "to improve the well-being of peoples and contribute to the fulfilment of their aspirations through, inter alia, the benefits resulting from increased mutual knowledge and from progress and achievement in the economic, scientific, technological, social, cultural and humanitarian fields". Finally, the Final Act formulates the readiness of the participating States to fulfil in good faith their obligations under international law, both those obligations arising from the generally recognised principles and rules of international law and those obligations arising from treaties or other agreements, in conformity with international law, to which they are parties.

Over the ten years since the signing of the Helsinki Final Act the socialist countries have been applying vigorous and consistent efforts towards the practical realisation of its provisions in relations among the signatory States.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985

European Economic Cooperation

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 82-86

[Article by Academician O. Bogomolov, director, Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the signing of the Final Act at it proved to be a unique event not only in the history of modern world politics but in the history of international relations in general. Indeed, during various European meetings in the past, such as the 1815 Congress of Vienna and the 1919 Peace Conference of Paris, individual states, or groups of states (usually the victors in a war), ensured unilateral advantages for themselves at the expense of other countries.

The Final Act provisions on promotion of cooperation among the countries that took part in the Conference in the economy, science, technology, environmental protection and in the solution of other regional and global problems of concern to the peoples of Europe and the whole of mankind laid the material foundation of the edifice of security for all the countries on the continent. It is useful to view from this vantage point the current economic situation in the world as a whole and East-West cooperation in Europe. This is all the more important since the greater part of East-West business relations is conducted in Europe.

Certain economic recovery has been observed in the world capitalist economy since the 1980-1982 crisis, though many consequences of the crisis are yet to be overcome. After two years of stagnation and reduction, world trade increased somewhat in 1983 (by 1-2 per cent), to reach the 1980 level. In 1984 the growth was 8 per cent (due mainly to the import boom in the USA). The world trade growth was also facilitated by the increased import by Western Europe and expanded export from the developing and European socialist countries.

However, for the 24 capitalist member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) the problems of unemployment and inflation remain acute. The number of jobless in 1983 increased there by 2 million, which brought the total number to 32.4 million, a postwar record high. Though the unemployment level went down by 1.1 million in 1984, this was mainly due to the partial growth of employment in the USA. In Europe, however, the number of jobs was decreasing. This year expects to see continued unemployment growth in Western Europe. Recently the increase of inflation in the capitalist world slowed down somewhat, though it still is considerable. In 1983 and 1984 consumer prices in the OECD countries grew by over 5 per cent, while the inflation rate in the four bigger West European countries was 1 to 2 points above the average, and in the group of smaller West European countries it was more than twice the average rate.

On the whole, the economic recovery in the West does not seem stable, considering the controversial development of the US economy and of the international financial system as a whole which is still dominated by the US dollar.

The arms race is a heavy burden on the US budget which is balanced more often than not by a swelling state debt which has tripled over the past decade to reach the staggering sum of almost \$1,600,000 million. Meanwhile half of the US budget deficit is in effect financed by money

coming in from abroad: over \$100,000 million came to the United States from foreign countries in 1981. "Europe and the Third World were given the honour of promoting, against their own will, US economic recovery," remarked the French weekly *Le Monde diplomatique* in June 1984. One might add to this the dubious "honour" of paying for the mammoth programme of the arms race being escalated by the Washington Administration.

The improvement of the world economic situation and promotion of business relations between the East and West are obstructed not only by protectionism but also by any discriminatory measures used by some Western countries in trade with socialist states. The application of trade sanctions and of technological embargoes as a means of political pressure is inadmissible. By increasing foreign trade limitations the USA and West European countries may lose markets, while it is hard to maintain business activity unless trade is expanded in all areas.

As for the economic advance of the European countries which are members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), it is also affected some way or another by the global economic processes and the economic situation in Western Europe. On the whole, however, this advance is governed, of course, by its own laws and comes up against entirely different problems. In the first place, this process in the CMEA countries is more dynamic than it is in Western Europe. Owing to annual and medium-term national economic planning, the rhythm of the CMEA countries' development is more stable and reliable than that of the market economy in the West.

In Western Europe, the growth of the gross domestic product was 2.3 per cent in 1984, whereas in the European CMEA countries it was roughly 3.6 per cent. According to the plans for 1985, the increment of the aggregate national income of the European CMEA countries is expected to be 3.8 per cent; that of industrial output, about 4 per cent; and farm produce, 4.8 per cent.

Most of the European CMEA countries are striving to mobilise reserves for accelerating socio-economic development. However, in the next five-year period the growth of the gross social product in these countries is expected to remain at 3.4 per cent. The stress will be on restoring a balanced development of the economy and foreign ties, on improving the quality, not increasing the quantity, of output. It is planned to expand investment activity and gradually enlarge the accumulation share in the national income of the countries where this share has shrunk considerably (to 12-15 per cent) over the past few years.

The export potential of the CMEA countries, judging by the first draft plans, will increase and diversify. Their import requirements are to rise as well. In this process the volume of their foreign trade is expected to be growing faster than the gross social product.

The achievements of the European CMEA countries in economic advance, as well as their plans, are associated more with deepening integrational cooperation in the CMEA framework, from which every member state is to benefit considerably. In particular, there will be a possibility to buy and sell goods at a profit and receive credits (often with no alternative), to meet the greater part of import requirements in energy and raw materials on a long-term, guaranteed and planned basis, to conduct accounts without using convertible currency, to enjoy price and credit benefits, and so on.

These countries participate in large joint projects and programmes which are rarely found in world practice. Among them are main pipelines, power transmission lines, atomic power stations, ore dressing plants, programmes for specialisation and co-operation of production in electronics, atomic engineering, electrical engineering, manufacture of bearings,

etc. As distinct from the Common Market, which is semi-dependent on fuel imports from third countries, the CMEA countries community itself satisfies 90-95 per cent of its requirements for not only energy but other raw materials.

The results of the June 1985 Meeting of the 40th Session of the CMEA Countries are particularly important in this respect. Discussed at it were the coordination of the economic development of the fraternal countries, their capital investment policy, the programme to save raw materials and energy, the joint development and introduction of new technology and engineering, and the renewal of production funds. The session participants confirmed the stand in favour of the establishment of normal equitable relations with the capitalist states and their groupings, above all the EEC, in the spirit of the provisions of the Final Act.

By contrast with stagnation in world trade, and even its reduction in 1981-1983, the foreign trade of the European group of the CMEA countries grew steadily at an annual rate of 1.5 per cent (with the exception of Poland and Romania). In 1984 this growth rate even increased somewhat (especially due to import) and was observed in all the CMEA countries without exception. The measures to deepen integrational cooperation in the CMEA framework, while the political and economic situation for promoting business ties with the West worsened, brought about some growth in the share of trade among the CMEA countries in all their foreign trade in the past few years.

Understandably, the economic situation in the capitalist world and in the socialist world inevitably influences business cooperation between the countries of different systems, though not in the same way. East-West relations account for a mere 3.1 per cent of world trade and therefore their influence on global economic processes is fairly small. At the same time these relations depend considerably on economic situation and foreign trade with the West, which are unstable. Besides, East-West relations are not of the same significance for both sides. The share of industrialised capitalist states in the foreign trade of socialist countries amounted to 26-30 per cent in recent years, whereas the share of the OECD countries in trade with the socialist world is a few times smaller, though these countries, especially the West European ones, cannot ignore them either for economic or political reasons.

In the first half of the 1970s the commodity turnover between the European CMEA countries and the West grew at a high rate, in the latter half of that decade it slowed down a great deal, and in the early 1980s the slow down was followed by stagnation. The year 1983 saw some revival of trade due to the expansion of commodity exchange of the CMEA countries with Western Europe. In 1984 East-West trade continued to grow on the whole, though the increase in trade between the USSR and the West slowed down somewhat. The assets of the European CMEA countries in Western banks greatly increased, and their net hard currency debt dropped essentially between late 1982 and the end of 1984.

Though the CMEA countries have improved the balance of settlements with the West and put their hard currency debt under control, many other outstanding problems of their business cooperation are still to be resolved. It is necessary, in particular, to improve the commodity pattern of exchange on which expansion of trade between them depends. Fuel, raw materials and foodstuffs still account for over 75 per cent of the CMEA export to the West, and finished goods for about 25 per cent (the latter include a mere 7 per cent of machines and equipment).

Building up their joint scientific and technological potential, the CMEA countries do not strive to shut themselves off from the rest of the world in science and technology, which was again demonstrated at their Economic Summit Conference in June 1984. Exchanges and contacts in

This and in many other spheres are inevitable. The CMEA countries merely wish to be invulnerable in the vital areas of scientific and technological progress.

Speaking in terms of purely economic preconditions and interests, the East-West relations have sufficient reserves for growth on both sides. If the political climate improves, an expansion of the share of the West in the CMEA's foreign trade should not be ruled out.

The switch of the CMEA economies over to intensive development will also increase their export and import potentials in regard to the West, and will change the demand and supply pattern. The CMEA countries will be enhancing the effectiveness of their import by purchasing more machine systems and production lines to re-equip engineering, the industrial and agricultural infrastructure and the light and food industries and to introduce industrial technologies in farming. The complete construction in these countries of industrial enterprises, including medium and small ones, with the aid of Western firms, especially on the compensation basis, would open up great prospects for these relations.

Experts from the European CMEA countries have noted the need for new forms of East-West cooperation. In particular, possibilities of setting up joint societies and the practice of creating special economic zones for the operation of foreign and mixed companies on the territories of socialist countries are being studied.

New vast programmes of boosting cooperation in the area of production, science and technology within the CMEA framework provide for increasing effective export to the West. This is one of the preconditions for meeting convertible currency liabilities. The task here is to harness fully the vast scientific and technological potential of the CMEA countries, and provisions are made to modify the export of fuel, raw materials and foodstuffs by advancing the level of processing and increasing the proportion of semi-manufactures.

The instability of the world capitalist economy has an adverse effect on CMEA export of raw materials, foodstuffs and finished goods to Western markets and on repayment of debts and interest. This often causes losses because of the unfavourable proportion of export and import prices, jacked up interest rates, the exaggerated rate of the US dollar protectionism, and the discriminatory trade and credit policy of the Western powers.

The CMEA countries are in favour of improved world economic relations through strict observance of the principles of equality, mutual benefit, respect for the interests of each other, and renunciation of discrimination practices and the use of trade as a means of political pressure. The futility of all sorts of sanctions and embargoes is also admitted by many sober-minded people in the West. This conclusion has been made, for instance, by the authors of the book *Wirtschaftskrieg oder Entspannung? Eine Politische Bilanz der Ost-West Wirtschaftsbeziehungen* (*Economic War or Defeat? The Political Outcome of East-West Economic Relations*), published in the FRG in 1981. In their opinion, "sanctions can be used effectively only by the strong against the weak. If both are equally strong, they cannot effectively punish each other, though they can cause harm to one another".

One can hardly deny this. Reality insistently demands that the stick-and-carrot policies in international economic relations should be discarded and these relations should be based on the sound principles of deriving mutual benefit, and refraining from causing harm to one another.

All should explore together the best acceptable solutions to regulate the economic activity of the world community and to provide favourable conditions for trade, for the much-needed restructuring of world production and trade, for efficient use of raw material and energy resources

and protection of the environment. It would be advisable to draw up an effective reform of the international currency system and legally formalise and improve the relations between the CMEA and the Common Market, and to elaborate confidence building measures in the economic sphere as well.

Mutually beneficial and businesslike cooperation between the West and the socialist states which develop their economies in accordance with five-year plans and long-term programmes can introduce elements of stability in the foreign economic relations of the Western countries, especially European ones. Its successful development would, in turn, also have a positive effect on the East-West political relations, facilitate the implementation of the Helsinki accords and promote the constructive European process started a decade ago in the Finnish capital.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

'Economic Exchanges: A Factor for Peace'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 86-88

[Article by Prof A. Bykov, D. Sc. (Econ.), head of sector, Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

Academician Bogomolov in his contribution has stressed the role of growing business ties between countries with different social systems for strengthening security on the European continent and in the world as a whole. It is far from accidental that the Helsinki Conference discussed the problems of security and cooperation simultaneously and in their interconnection.

The period preceding the European Conference and the Conference itself were marked by active development of economic, scientific and technological cooperation among its participants which could not but contribute to its success by creating favourable material underpinnings. It will be recalled that East-West trade increased sixfold in the 1970s, mostly in the first half of the decade. Along with traditional trade new forms emerged, such as industrial cooperation (including certain forms of joint enterprises) scientific and technological cooperation, license operations, and major joint projects in production and infrastructure. All this gave rise to numerous links among European states in various fields of production, science and technology.

The Final Act institutionalised that process, reaffirming the unchallengeable truth that interstate economic cooperation should develop on an equal, mutually beneficial basis, that it is a boon of which every member of the international community can avail itself on a common democratic basis in accordance with its interests and possibilities and the interests and possibilities of its partners; that there should be no discrimination of any side because its social system or its domestic or foreign policy differs from the policies of the partner countries, let alone resorting to direct pressure by interfering in their internal affairs, employing the weapon of economic blockade, blackmail and sanctions.

There are no grounds, of course, for regarding the 1970s as the Golden Age of East-West economic cooperation, as is sometimes done in the West, and to claim that it can never happen again in the present or in the future. That decade, while largely successful in terms of mutual cooperation, had its formidable problems.

While expanding cooperation and ties with the socialist countries, the West, notably the USA, did not give up its intention of using these

ties for its selfish ends, for undermining the socialist community. This was witnessed, for example, by the so-called differentiated policy with regard to the socialist countries which some quarters in the capitalist world saw as a means of influencing their domestic and foreign policies. Western scholars hoped to use that approach as a means to bolster their theory of "convergence" of the two opposite social systems. And that period saw discrimination, albeit on a limited scale, against the socialist countries in trade and, in particular, in access to high technology.

When the present US Administration swerved from cooperation to confrontation there was a sharp drop in East-West trade and economic, especially scientific and technological ties. The false thesis used to justify this was that such ties, like detente as a whole, were allegedly good only for the socialist countries and damaging for the Western powers. It was asserted that the USSR and the other socialist countries gained many unilateral advantages in the military, political and economic fields from detente and that the USSR, by using Western technology, has strengthened its defences and has come to threaten the interests of the Western countries. In these conditions the Western powers, primarily the USA, had to "rearm" their military forces in order to make up for lost ground, but in fact, in order to gain military strategic superiority.

Washington and the NATO leadership insist that the socialist countries should be denied new technology and credits, which amounts to disrupting normal business exchanges between them and imposing harsh restrictions on these exchanges. Washington definitely hoped to cut the socialist countries off from world scientific and technological progress and the high technology market, and thereby win the competition between the two systems. To this end, NATO and its body controlling exports to the socialist countries (COCOM) draw up more and more lists of banned items and impose more stringent control over their observance.

These actions are clearly in violation of the Helsinki Final Act and international law, and run counter to the interests of world scientific and technological progress and world trade, the real alignment of forces in the world, and in the final analysis, the interests of the West itself. In this connection one may analyse data recently published by *The Washington Post*. It wrote that if supplies of industrial goods from developed capitalist countries had dropped by 50 per cent over three years (1981-1983) their aggregate GNPs would have decreased by \$30,000 million while the loss of the Soviet GNP would amount to a mere \$4,500 million.

The fallacy of the West's stake on economic and scientific and technological isolation of the socialist countries is glaring. The USSR and the socialist community as a whole possess one third of the world scientific and technological potential and lead the world in many areas of the economy, science and technology. Socialist economic integration is making headway, enabling the fraternal countries to interact closely in tackling their main economic, scientific, technological and social tasks. It is a vain hope that without exchange with the West the socialist community would not be able to intensify and speed up its scientific and technological progress and that its socio-economic system and its institutions are allegedly unable to bring the socialist community to a new stage in the scientific and technological revolution.

In purely commercial terms, the USA is grossly neglectful of the interests of its allies, in particular of Western Europe. The USA accounts for less than one tenth of Western technology exports to the socialist countries while as much as 80 per cent of their technology exports come from Western Europe. It is, therefore, not in the interests of Western Europe to discard detente and forgo the benefits of economic cooperation with the CMEA countries at Washington's bidding. These ties have

already brought tangible benefits to West Europeans, both commercially and in the broader social and political sense, and they do not seem inclined to give them up.

This is borne out by the growing exchanges between Western Europe and the CMEA countries in the recent period and the failure of Washington's attempts to forbid its European partners to supply equipment for the gas pipeline linking Siberia with Western Europe. And there is growing discontent inside the United States over the restrictions on trade and other exchanges with the socialist countries which have already deprived American business of thousands of millions dollars and many jobs.

In these conditions Washington has had to manoeuvre, but it has not relinquished its efforts to undermine East West business cooperation. The USA's allies on the one hand say that an "economic NATO" is unacceptable but on the other are inclined to yield to Washington's demands for the sake of "Atlantic solidarity". This was highlighted by the summit meetings of the Big Seven and the recent COCOM measures to toughen restrictions on the supplies of computer and communications technology to the Soviet Union. At the same time, the allies of the USA cannot but be concerned that Washington's technological and trade war is not only against the socialist states (and the developing countries by means of technological neocolonialism) but also against its NATO partners and Japan, whose competitiveness the USA is trying hard to diminish.

The CMEA countries, naturally, take into account the unfavourable international and world economic situation and the growing discrimination against the socialist states on the world capitalist market. Thus, they have taken measures to deepen their integration and conduct a concerted economic and scientific and technological policy, including its external aspects. They are taking effective joint steps to counter the discrimination against them and to accelerate scientific and technological progress, especially in the spearhead scientific and technological areas.

The Economic Summit Conference of the CMEA countries held in Moscow in June 1984 paid special attention to promoting economic, scientific and technological links among European states in the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid accords in order to expand trade and speed up technological progress, to solve raw materials and energy problems, problems of international transport, environmental protection and creating new jobs. These problems are undoubtedly high on the agenda of the West European countries, in particular in view of the current restructuring of their economies, an area where they lag behind the USA and Japan.

It is clear that if the West European countries are to overcome this lag they should opt for extensive European cooperation to ensure harmonious and optimal use, in mutually acceptable forms, of the vast aggregate potential of the Eastern and Western parts of the continent for peaceful constructive purposes and not allow themselves to be drawn into the implementation of plans of harnessing the technological, scientific and production potential of the West European countries to the preparations for "star wars".

While understandably seeking to promote mutually beneficial economic, scientific and technological exchanges in Europe, the CMEA does not rule out expansion of similar ties with the USA, Japan and other countries where there is considerable untapped potential as well. Needless to say, this could only happen if both sides show an interest in tapping this potential for the sake of peace and progress of these peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985

'The USA and the European Process'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 89-91

[Article by Prof Yu. Daydov, D. Sc. (Hist.), head of the Department of the Institute of the United States and Canada, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

Each of the 35 countries taking part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe approached the final meeting in Finlandia Hall in Helsinki in its own way. For some this path had been quite clear from the outset, being wholly in keeping with the fundamental principles of their peaceable foreign policies. For others it involved serious thoughts, vacillations and reappraisals of their own policies.

In June 1970 the Warsaw Treaty member countries stated in the Budapest Memorandum that they considered it useful to include the USA and Canada along with the European countries among the potential participants in the European forum. They proceeded from the belief that the USA, as a participant in the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements, had its share of responsibility to bear for ensuring a sound and lasting peace in Europe, based on the cooperation between states with different social systems. Moreover, the socialist countries could not disregard the fact of US military presence in Europe.

The inclusion of the USA in the European forum after long years of its active resistance to the holding of the European Conference undoubtedly played a positive role. First, this extended the regional framework of the Conference and created the prerequisites for spreading its influence to international relations in general. Second, this opened up better possibilities for promoting the questions of military detente on the European continent. Third, this made the ruling circles of Western Europe, that were still afraid to meet the Soviet Union "face to face", more willing to extend the sphere of detente in scope and strength. Fourth, new prerequisites were created for achieving Soviet-American interaction and spreading it to the European continent.

At the same time, one cannot disregard the fact that the USA had been induced to take part in the European process, and that this had been more of a tactical move than principled resolve. The US leadership regarded its participation in this process first and foremost as a temporary concession: a concession to the general trend for improved East-West relations which had become obvious at the turn of the 1970s; a concession to the Soviet Union, Washington being deeply interested in normalising relations with it, especially in view of the "Vietnamese catastrophe"; a concession to its own allies which were not only interested in promoting East-West cooperation in Europe but had already set it going; a concession to US public opinion tired of the never-ending cold war; a concession to the majority of the establishment worried by the sharp deterioration of US international positions and calling for a respite to achieve even a temporary stabilisation of the world situation. The US ruling circles agreed to join the European process but they were guided not so much by a desire to work for its progress as by the belief that they would be able to influence it to their own advantage and at best, have control of it.

The process of making alterations in US policy in Europe in keeping with the new realities obtaining in the world was in itself a complex one.

This approach, passive and unconstructive as it was at the initial stage when the principles of the Final Act were elaborated and agreed upon (under the Nixon and Ford Administrations), gave way under President Carter to attempts to use some of the provisions of the Helsinki

document against the countries of the socialist community. The present US Administration makes no secret of its desire to torpedo the European process.

For nearly ten years now Washington has not spared its efforts to undermine the very idea of the mutual security of socialist and capitalist countries in Europe that was embodied in the Final Act. Instead of working to achieve a compromise settlement between East and West, the USA increasingly concentrated the efforts of NATO countries on military preparations. Evidence of this is the deployment of new US missiles in Western Europe.

The Rogers Plan tabled in 1982 and approved at the session of the NATO Council in December 1984 envisages the rearmament of the bloc's armies with new-generation weapons, making them capable of hitting targets 300-500 kilometres deep inside the territories of the Warsaw Treaty states. In March 1983 the US President launched a programme envisaging a large-scale "anti-missile defence system" with space-based elements. This programme objectively destabilises the strategic situation between East and West.

The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is based on the mutual consent of its signatories, being a kind of "balance of their interests". In this respect it is highly important to maintain the appropriate political atmosphere in Europe and firstly in East-West relations, just as it is to undertake vital political, economic, military and cultural measures enhancing this consent and extending it to new spheres of activity. Contrary to this, Washington's actions for almost a decade now have been aimed at wrecking this consent and narrowing down the spheres of its action, at aggravating East-West political relations.

It was under President Carter that the campaign of gross interference in the domestic affairs of the USSR and other socialist countries was launched under the hypocritical pretext of "defending human rights". The meeting in Belgrade of states participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was to map out concrete ways of strengthening and extending the European process was turned through no little effort on the part of Washington and some of its allies into an arena of acute ideological confrontation between East and West. No less destructive were the activities of the US Republican Administration at the Madrid meeting. By making ultimatum demands to the USSR and other countries of the socialist community the USA attempted to curtail the European process in general. It put up a particularly stubborn fight against the holding of a Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, proposed by the socialist and several Western countries as well.

It has been beyond doubt affected by many factors, external and internal, sometimes of a purely time-serving nature. Yet the principal role here belongs to the following two circumstances.

First a sensible approach to safeguarding security in Europe along the lines of establishing mutually advantageous cooperation between states with different social systems is something alien to the US ruling elite. Washington views this problem (as it does many other world issues) first and foremost from the standpoint of power factors. In other words, the security of West European states can be ensured only by providing the West with a strong military potential which should be steadily built up and modernised.

This actually boils down to safeguarding "security" for oneself by lessening it for others. Hence the stereotype indoctrinated by the US propaganda machine into the minds of the public in capitalist countries: "Peace has been maintained in Europe for 40 years now only through the

existence of NATO." The logical conclusion is that NATO's superiority over the Warsaw Treaty allegedly ensures "absolute security" for Europe.

Furthermore, growth of competition instead of cooperation in Europe is more suited to the self-seeking interests of the USA. Even in the years of detente, to say nothing of the subsequent period, Washington had far from welcomed the expanding ties between the capitalist and socialist states of Europe. A Europe split into two military camps, suspicious of each other, is better suited to the aims of the US aggressive foreign policy with regard to the socialist countries and its Western partners.

At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the hopes of the US leaders to undermine and discredit the European process, to give it a one-sided edge, in which they had succeeded along some lines, fell short of their reckonings on the whole. US antidetente activities have come up not only against the principled position of the USSR and other socialist countries but also against opposition from the West European countries, and among them the US allies who resent their senior partner's irresponsible gambling with the destinies of Europe and increasing disregard for their interests, including those in respect of the socialist countries.

Nevertheless, one cannot fail to see that despite the resentful attitude of the more influential US ruling circles to the European process, they are no longer in a position to ignore not only the process itself but also its trends of development. All attempts to wreck this process virtually lead—and this became clear at the Madrid meeting—to the isolation of the USA, and this cannot help alerting the more realistically minded quarters in Washington.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

'Western Reactionaries Undermine Security'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 91-93

[Article by A. Vakhrameyev, Cand. Sc. (Hist.), senior researcher at the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] It is fair to believe that the holding of the European Conference and the signing of its Final Act were a triumph of reason which benefited both socialist and capitalist states. And still there were losers: the aggressive forces, the right-wingers, the conservative and extremist circles of imperialism, the military-industrial complex, the politicians in the West who were working for a cold war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

It is not surprising, therefore, that right after the conclusion of the Helsinki Conference the enemies of detente launched a propaganda campaign to discredit its results. In doing so, they tried to create the impression that the results of the Conference, specifically the confirmation by its participants of the principles of inviolability of European borders and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, were a concession to the USSR the West could not afford. The provisions of the Final Act were treated in a biased and one-sided manner by bourgeois propaganda and by some leaders of Western countries. In the USA, for instance, the stress in official interpretation of the content of the Final Act was on "human rights". Strident propaganda campaigns in the West over the alleged "human rights violations" in the USSR and other socialist countries were staged to discredit the CSCE process as a whole and obstruct

the implementation of the Final Act provisions pertaining to political, economic, scientific, cultural and humanitarian cooperation of the states that had taken part in the Conference. Simultaneously, definite circles in the West, especially the intelligence services of the capitalist states, attempted to use these provisions in order to legalise political and ideological sabotage against the socialist community.

However, the chief instrument used by the enemies of European and international détente has, undoubtedly, been the course for upsetting the military strategic parity between the USSR and the USA, and between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, achieved in the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the course for stepping up the arms race in the capitalist world and developing and deploying the latest types of modern weaponry.

The start of the deployment of US nuclear first-strike weapons in West European countries changed entirely the military strategic situation in Europe and greatly destabilised it. This change occurred because, first, the missiles are deployed to upset the parity in medium-range delivery means between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, second, it gives the USA an opportunity to deliver a first disarming strike within a few seconds at the Soviet Union's political and military administration centres, control and communications posts, missile launching pads and aircraft; third, it enables the USA to keep the USSR and other socialist countries, as well as countries of North Africa and the Middle East under a constant threat of attack; and, fourth, it offers a possibility to heap on the USSR and its allies an additional burden of expenditures on neutralising and retaliatory measures.

Thus, this greatly increases the war danger in Europe because, even if a single missile is launched by mistake or by accident, the whole retaliation system will automatically come into play and there will be no chance to ascertain why a missile was fired and to correct the error.

It is justly believed in the West the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe may encourage the USA to do the same in other parts of the world. Plans for deploying medium-range nuclear missiles are known to be devised by the USA with regard to the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, the Korean Peninsula and other regions.

Destabilisation and the threat of war in Europe will be increased in no smaller degree by the implementation by the US Administration of its space militarisation plans, as also by its attempts to involve its European allies in space militarisation.

Though these US plans and efforts are strongly opposed by the European public and many West European politicians, one should not ignore the fact that the US Administration is exerting strong pressure on the allies to involve them in the "strategic defense initiative"; nor should it be forgotten that there operates a fairly influential "space lobby" in some West European countries - the military-industrial complex.

Under the cover of US missiles, when plans for enlisting the cooperation of Western Europe in space militarisation are debated, the right-wing, conservative and nationalistic forces have grown active in Western Europe itself, above all in the FRG. Under their influence the country is being speedily militarised, the combat power of the Bundeswehr is being built up and its actions are coordinated ever more closely with the actions of the US armed forces in the FRG and with the military organisation of NATO. The FRG government adopted back in October 1984 the "Bundeswehr planning" programme for the period up to the year 2000. According to the programme not less than DM1 trillion will be set aside for rearming the Bundeswehr with a new generation of conventional weapons.

After the Western European Union lifted the last restrictions on building a navy, which had been imposed on the FRG after the Second World

War, and allowed it to manufacture long range missiles and strategic bombers in June 1984, the FRG got an opportunity to produce all types of modern weapons with the exception of nuclear ones.

The militarisation of the FRG, which is being turned into a powerful and major bridgehead for aggression against socialist countries, is accompanied by increasing attempts of political, legal and ideological justification of such actions. "Social" and "territorial" revanchism campaign, the primary means used to achieve this goal, is consistently carried out by certain circles in the FRG and enjoys indirect, and sometimes even direct, support from the ruling CDU/CSU bloc and some other members of the Federal government.

"Social revanchism" means demands that the FRG alone can represent the whole of Germany and the illusory hopes for a reunification of Germany on Bonn's terms which envisage, as before, the elimination of the socialist social system in the GDR. "Territorial revanchism" means allegations that the FRG is not only the legal successor of the Hitler Reich, but a state which after the reunification of Germany should be restored within the 1937 borders. Proceeding from these wild claims, the revanchist groupings in the FRG openly call the treaties and agreements envisaging the inviolability of the present borders "temporary" and "unlawful".

It is symptomatic that these claims are backed up by the Bonn authorities despite their assurances that the FRG is faithful to the spirit and the letter of the international treaties and agreements it has signed. But the speeches by the FRG government members, including Chancellor Helmut Kohl, at meetings and conferences of revanchist unions and land associations are in glaring contradiction with these assurances. The speech made by Kohl at the conference of the land association of Germans from Silesia, held in June 1985 in Hannover under the slogan "Forty years in exile. Silesia remains our Fatherland in a Europe of free nations", evoked angry protests from the progressive and peace forces in the FRG and outside it.

As was noted at the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty countries, held in December 1984 in Berlin, the invigoration of the revanchist forces in the FRG and the encouragement of revanchism anywhere else have an adverse effect on the political climate in Europe, and on understanding among European nations.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

'Problems of Military Detente'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 93-95

[Article by N. Kishilov, Cand. Sc. (Hist.), leading researcher, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

Other speakers here have already said that after a period of detente in the 1970s Europe again entered a stage of serious tensions. It would be logical to ask how long this stage may last and what measures are necessary to restore detente and bring back the relations between all the participants in the European process to an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence.

It is true that detente, whose manifestations were particularly favourable for Europe, was disrupted in the late 1970s. As has been shown here, it was disrupted by the actions of the USA and other NATO countries. The opponents of peaceful coexistence and cooperation have exhibited particular zeal after the coming to office of the Republican Administration

in the USA which set out to gear all the aspects of the relations between the two social systems to military confrontation, and to turn the competition between the two systems into a total confrontation.

In order to achieve military superiority over the USSR, Washington has, since the beginning of the 1980s, looked for ever new means of building up its armaments. The same period saw an extremely dangerous switch in the American military doctrine to the concept that nuclear war was winnable. West European NATO allies of the USA are also contributing to the arms race. France, for example, is engaged in a massive buildup of its nuclear arsenals. Britain is nurturing ambitious plans of refitting its atomic submarines with American Trident missiles. The FRG has actively joined in the arms race. All this has seriously aggravated tensions and undermined detente. For the existing military equilibrium is a real foundation of detente, an important factor for strategic stability. Attempts to break the military strategic balance and to upset parity in one way or another inevitably aggravate tensions and the threat of war.

This is not the first time in history that a military equilibrium exists between different states or groups of states. But for the first time in history one side in the military balance is the socialist system which by its class nature does not need conquests or expansion and, consequently, military superiority.

The arms race unleashed by the USA and its allies takes the most dangerous forms on the European continent where the armed forces of the two military political groupings are in direct contact and where both sides have vast amounts of modern technology, including mass destruction weapons.

Meanwhile, continued military equilibrium on the European continent is an important stabilizing factor not only in the relations between all the European states, as indeed between the USSR and the USA, but also in the world as whole.

What is the meaning of "the equilibrium of military forces on the European level"? In our view, it is a component element of the global military strategic parity between the USSR and the USA. The main components of the global military strategic balance include both offensive and defensive strategic forces of the sides.

There can naturally be no absolute symmetry in the nuclear delivery vehicles systems in the USSR and the USA (owing to the different levels of development of the strategic forces of the sides), in the summary levels of warheads, let alone in qualitative characteristics.

Parity in strategic forces between the USSR and the USA has existed since late 1960s-early 1970s. Throughout the period of the SALT-1 and SALT-2 talks it has been carefully verified and enshrined in a number of treaties and agreements between the two states. Thus, the military-strategic balance between the USSR and the USA on the global level is a historical objective reality and the basic criterion of the principle of equality and equal security of the sides.

The global military-strategic balance between the USSR and the USA does not automatically result in military equilibrium at the regional, in our case, the European level. The differences in the strategic potentials of the USSR and the USA are compounded by the geostrategic asymmetry between the two powers. Unlike the USSR, the USA may deliver nuclear strikes at Soviet targets not only with the help of intercontinental strategic missiles but also with medium range nuclear missiles and aircraft deployed close to the Soviet borders.

The equilibrium of military forces on the European level is a complex category comprising many components and at the same time it is a changeable category. Moreover, it is ensured by medium-range nuclear

systems (and operational tactical systems) belonging to the Soviet Union (the other Warsaw Treaty members do not have such systems), on the one hand, and by the nuclear forces of the USA, Britain and France, on the other. Other elements in the regional equilibrium are conventional armed forces and the armaments of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries both as a whole and in particular in Central Europe, the main area of confrontation between the two military political groupings.

Equilibrium does not mean arithmetical equality and qualitative characteristics of medium range nuclear missile systems of the USSR, on the one hand, and the USA, France and Britain, on the other. Nor is there complete parity as regards the number of divisions and the main types of weapons of the sides. The structure and organisation of the armed forces are also different.

The main thing is not to allow the particular imbalances revealed in comparing individual components to undermine and upset the military equilibrium as a whole. The component elements of military equilibrium may change due to political, economic, technical, military-strategic and other factors. The development, adoption and deployment of new weapon systems entail dangerous destabilisation of the existing balance of forces in Europe. The deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles presents a special danger.

There has been a consensus among the military experts and scholars in the West and East since the 1970s that beyond a certain level the increase in the quantity of weapons is more perceived as increasing the threat and uncertainty for others rather than strengthening one's own security. Experts in the socialist countries are convinced that security can be strengthened only by limiting armaments and lowering levels of military confrontation. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have consistently adhered to that line throughout the postwar period.

The set of Soviet proposals on foreign policy problems put forward at the 26th Congress of the CPSU and the Plenary Meetings of the CPSU Central Committee, the Sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Congresses and other forums of Communist and Workers' Parties of the European socialist countries gives priority to initiatives aimed at limiting and reducing armaments and troops, and expanding and deepening many-sided cooperation among the European states.

However, as everyone remembers, the USA, during the Geneva negotiations, rejected the Soviet proposals, which were constructive and went a long way to meet the West. The warnings of the Soviet representatives repeatedly expressed to the governments of West Germany, Britain, Italy and other European NATO countries have proved correct. The USA from the very outset did not want a mutually acceptable agreement on nuclear arms in Europe and did everything it could to prevent such an agreement. After the USA began deploying its cruise missiles and Pershing 2 ballistic missiles were brought to Europe without waiting for the end of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, the USSR had to discontinue these talks and resort to dosed retaliatory measures in order to restore the military equilibrium.

Yet even in these new conditions, when the European situation became particularly dangerous as a result of the actions of the USA and its NATO allies, the USSR and the other socialist countries persist in proposing measures that could bring down tensions, primarily by halting the arms race and lowering military confrontation between the sides.

Given political will on the part of the West, the outstanding questions can be resolved within not too long period of time. This will undoubtedly help to reduce international tensions, bring the situation in Europe back to normal, and to advance further along the road indicated by the Helsinki Conference.

CDE Conference

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 96-99

[Article by V. Sheremetyev]

[Text]

A special section in the Final Act deals with confidence-building measures of a purely military nature, also known as the first generation of confidence building measures. At the time the Final Act was signed in the context of political detente in Europe, those measures were quite sufficient. But now that detente has been damaged, only military and technical confidence-building measures between the socialist and capitalist countries are clearly not enough for normalising these relations and turning them back towards detente. To achieve this, it would be necessary to effect a set of military-political confidence-building measures (the second generation). These measures were tabled at the very start of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe by the Soviet delegation.

The Soviet proposals, backed by the delegations of other socialist countries, immediately found themselves in the focus of the Stockholm forum. Simultaneously, the NATO countries proposed purely military technical confidence-building measures designed not for limiting the military activities of the countries taking part in the Conference but for enabling the North Atlantic Alliance legally to obtain intelligence data on the defence potential of the Warsaw Treaty countries in the area up to the Urals.

The draft called The Main Provisions of the Treaty on the Mutual Renunciation of the Use of Armed Force and on the Maintenance of Relations of Peace, proposed by the Soviet delegation on January 29 this year, is an international legal document important both in content and form. It contains, in particular, suggestions on the subject and scope of the Treaty, on its signatories and the sphere of action, and includes provisions concerning the safety of international sea, air and space communications which are not under national jurisdiction, coordination with commitments under the UN Charter, and other significant provisions.

The pivotal provision of the draft treaty which could be signed by 35 states is the commitment not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms against each other, that is, not to use armed force against each other altogether. It would be no exaggeration to say that this idea is now winning ever broader recognition in the governmental, political and public quarters of Western Europe.

Many delegations have responded positively to this major Soviet initiative which suggests practical measures on confidence building in both the military and political spheres, which could truly bring about a decrease in the military confrontation in Europe. The Soviet draft treaty also takes into account the opinions voiced by other delegations during the general debate, and its flexible definitions open the way to a search for compromise solutions.

Taking part in the debate on the Soviet initiative are not just representatives of socialist, neutral and non-aligned states, but also of the NATO countries. However, the position of the latter on this issue seems dual. Admitting in words the need to consider the Soviet proposal, the United States and some other NATO countries would like in fact to confine themselves to discussing the possibility of mentioning the principle

of the non-use of force in a non-committal way and not in the form of an international legal act which must be complied with.

As for the commitment on refraining from the first use of nuclear arms, here, too, there is no sign, not even an outward one, of change in the NATO stance. The NATO countries refuse to assume such a commitment under the pretext that, faced with the powerful conventional arms and armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty, they, allegedly, cannot deprive themselves of the right to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The USA and its NATO allies thereby involuntarily expose before the world public their militarist doctrines allowing the possibility of waging a nuclear war and delivering a first strike.

These concepts are countered by the Soviet stand which is based on the inadmissibility of a nuclear or conventional war in Europe, which would have fatal consequences for the peoples of the continent. The Soviet Union is convinced that real moves towards strengthening European security and confidence (which is the main objective of the Stockholm Conference) are possible, provided that there is an all-round approach to the issue, that the large-scale political and international legal measures are closely interrelated with military-technical ones.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries advanced at the Stockholm Conference also a number of practical proposals regarding military detente. This past February the delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR and the Soviet Union submitted for the consideration of the Conference a working document providing for a limitation of the scope of military exercises. The document proposes that the countries taking part in the Conference should not conduct military exercises, independently or jointly with other states, involving more than 10,000 people in Europe and in the adjacent sea (ocean) region and in air space. And in March Czechoslovakia, Poland and the USSR proposed that the countries should give 30 days' notice about the start of large military exercises of land forces involving 20,000 or more effectives in Europe and the adjoining sea (ocean) region and air space, irrespective of whether the exercises are conducted individually or together with any components of the air force or the navy.

Following steadily the line of confidence- and security-building in Europe in military and political spheres, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and the USSR came up with a new major initiative on May 20 this year. In the working documents they presented at the Conference they developed and described in detail their proposal on notification of large-scale military exercises involving modern land, air and naval forces. On June 21, 1985, the Hungarian delegation presented at the Conference a new working document on notification of the start of large-scale movements and transfer of land forces and aviation in the region outlined in confidence-building measures, and also to a region and from it. Today, when the international situation has worsened and when the troop transfer of the US strategic reserve to Europe, which is increasing every year, has grown to ominous proportions, this proposal of the socialist countries would lessen the unpredictability, possible miscalculation and misunderstanding of the purpose of such actions and would thus decrease the war menace in Europe.

The neutral and non-aligned countries insistently demand that the Conference should proceed in a businesslike manner. The joint document presented by this group of countries in 1981 contains a number of positive provisions whose implementation would help lessen mistrust among states and lower the confrontation level between the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. In this document they rightly stressed the need to pay due attention to the inter-complementary character of the political and military aspects of security.

Furthermore, the Maltese delegation officially circulated at the Stockholm Conference a document on confidence- and security-building measures in the Mediterranean, envisaging both military and political measures pertaining to nuclear and conventional arms. The core of the new proposal is a pledge not to deploy nuclear arms in the Mediterranean, and to refrain from the use of armed force against Mediterranean states. On the whole, the provisions of this document on a number of issues accord with the Soviet proposals on making the Mediterranean a zone of lasting peace and cooperation.

However, the normal work of the Stockholm Conference is hampered by the unconstructive stance of the USA and some other NATO countries, which was set forth in their joint proposal issued on March 8 this year. This lengthy (17 pages) document repeats the initial ideas advanced by the NATO countries in Stockholm a year ago. They pertain to exchange of information on the structure of land and air forces, annual plans of military activity, and so on.

The weak points of their proposals are visible to the naked eye. Thus, some armed services having great combat power, the naval forces of NATO, the sea-based air force, and the independent activities of the air forces in the sea (ocean) area and air space bordering on Europe, are not to be affected by confidence building measures. The NATO countries' proposals do not as much as mention any limitation of the level and scope of military activity jeopardising European security. The entire territory of the United States and Canada is proposed to be excluded from the zone in which confidence building measures would be effected.

The NATO formula is based on the notorious concept of "transparency", interpreting confidence and security as exposure of the activities of armed forces of European states, primarily those of the Warsaw Treaty states. In their proposals the NATO countries attempt to impose on the Stockholm Conference delegates solutions running counter to the principles of the proceedings of the Conference agreed upon in Madrid: any resolutions on confidence- and security building measures should be adopted "on the basis of equality of rights, balance and reciprocity, equal respect for the security interests of all CSCE participating states".

So what is needed, after all, to make the working process in Stockholm gain strength, to direct the Conference along the path of concrete negotiations? What is needed is, above all, the political will of all the states participating in the Conference, the USA and its closest NATO allies in the first place; the political will to renounce the first use of nuclear arms and the use of armed force against each other in general, to recognise the legitimate right of all and every one to equal security, and strictly to abide by the principle of equality and equal security at the talks. What is needed is political will realised in practical deeds.

And, of course, there should be a careful attitude to the very fact that the Stockholm Conference is held in accordance with the understanding reached in Madrid. After all, the advancement of the European process started in Helsinki largely depends on the success of the Conference. Efforts should be taken so that the Conference is not overburdened with questions which do not directly pertain to the Conference agenda, and progress at the Conference should not be made to hinge on the results of other measures envisaged by the Madrid meeting.

Special mention should be made of the influence of public opinion on the Conference proceedings. The peace forces may well be called the "36th participant" in the European forum. Today, when the peoples are confronted with the threat of war, these forces are searching for a way out of this dangerous situation.

Therefore, after the start of the Stockholm Conference no significant international public meeting of a regional or all-European scope has

been held without the items on the agenda of the Stockholm Conference being discussed. Special interest is evoked by the large-scale political initiatives of the socialist countries, for they meet the interests of large sections of the population in the West who reject the militarist plans of the United States and NATO and realise that the struggle against war should be conducted before a war has broken out.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

European Cultural Contacts

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 99-102

[Article by Yu. Kashlev, D. Sc. (Hist.)]

[Text] I would like to begin our discussion of the subject by quoting some figures. Let us take *UNESCO Statistical Yearbook 1984* fascinating reading for those who value figures as indicators of world developments and open the chapter on Europe. The population of Europe (the USSR included) is 15 per cent of the world total. Europe has over 30 per cent of the world's radio stations and over 10 per cent of all TV sets, and accounts for more than 45 per cent of the total press run of daily newspapers, over 55 per cent of all book publications (number of titles) and over 70 per cent of all stationary cinema theatres. The situation is almost the same in terms of theatres, museums, and so on. Taking into account the historical cultural integration of neighbouring peoples, the community and affinity of languages, the extensive economic and social ties, and mass tourism, one cannot disregard such an essential factor as cultural contacts among Europeans when the point in question is the present and future of the European continent.

Following a long break in their cultural ties, which had been wrecked by the Second World War and the subsequent cold war, the European peoples began to show a great urge for the revival and development of those ties. In the 1960s and 1970s a number of interstate agreements of this kind were concluded; regular exchanges of artistic collectives, exhibitions and public delegations were introduced; tourism was making headway, and exchange of information through the latest technical means of communication was substantially increased. An additional impetus in this sphere, however, came from the European Conference. During its preparation aspects of cooperation in culture, information, education and human contacts were discussed alongside political and trade and economic questions, which were reflected in a special section of the Helsinki Final Act known among diplomats as the "third basket".

The Helsinki Final Act became the first historic document to incorporate a special section dealing with cooperation in the cultural and humanitarian fields between countries with different social systems. It became possible to achieve unanimous approval in such a complex area owing to the precise definition of the principles underlying this cooperation. On the insistence of the socialist countries, the Final Act clearly states that this cooperation must be exercised while fully observing the principles guiding relations among the participating states such as sovereign equality, equal rights, non-intervention in internal affairs, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The programme of interstate contacts in the humanitarian and cultural fields adopted along these lines may be considered unique as regards the scope of trends and forms of cooperation. It envisages the develop-

ment of bilateral and multilateral cultural ties—on the basis of the relevant agreements—between state institutions, creative organisations and workers in culture; improved public access to the treasures of world culture; the promotion of the translation of works of literature; the holding of film festivals; and the encouragement of such forms of cultural cooperation as: book exhibitions and fairs, international events in the fields of art, theatre, music, folklore, etc.

It was planned to extend links in the fields of science and the mass media, between organisations and citizens of the participants and to assist in reunification of families and development of tourism.

What has been done to put the Helsinki records into practice?

The period between 1975 and the early 1980s was one of rather intensive and stable quantitative and qualitative growth of cultural ties. It saw the conclusion of an unprecedented number of intergovernmental agreements and the development of regular exchanges between leading art companies and exhibitions; the publication of foreign authors increased. Film exchange between East and West European countries was on the upgrade and personal contacts between people engaged in cultural activities were expanded.

This favourable development was drastically undermined at the outset of the 1980s by the anti-detente policy of the new US Administration which went hand in hand with the curtailing of ties with socialist countries and attempts to launch a campaign of boycott against them with the participation of the West European NATO member states. Regrettably, some of them followed Washington's example, with the result that in the 1980-1982 period their ties with the Soviet Union were practically "frozen".

This situation, one unnatural for Europe, could not last for long. Just as in politics, trade, and economics, where Western Europe showed a marked interest in preserving detente, in the sphere of culture, too, it began to re-establish contacts in 1982 on the same scale as before. Since then the Soviet Union has signed intergovernmental agreements and cultural exchange programmes with many countries, among them Austria, Greece, Britain, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands and Finland. In 1984 alone more than 100 artistic collectives, over 100 soloists and 40 exhibitions were sent by the USSR Ministry of Culture to European capitalist countries. The figures are even higher for cultural exchange with the fraternal socialist countries in Europe.

Highly impressive are the figures for the publication of books by foreign authors, including books by authors from the states participants in the European Conference. Over the years since the Helsinki summit the total press run of books by foreign authors put out in the USSR has nearly doubled, and the annual figure is now approximately 150 million copies. Since 1975 the Soviet Union has published a 200-volume *Library of World Literature* which contains 137 volumes of foreign authors (2,600 authors in all). It is now completing the publication of a 50-volume *Library of World Literature for Children*. A direct result of the Helsinki records was the publication of a five-volume *Poetry of Europe* (with verse in the original language and in Russian) and a book of poems entitled *Twentieth Century Europe* and others.

It is appropriate to recall here that the idea of reciprocity and compliance with the Helsinki records is central to the Final Act. And it is reciprocity that is often lacking on the part of some of our Western partners. There is still a marked imbalance between the socialist and capitalist countries participating in the European Conference in publishing each other's authors, and showing films and TV programmes. On the whole, the number of books by Western authors put out in the Soviet Union is two to four times greater than the number of books by Soviet

authors published in the West (to say nothing of their total press run, which is beyond comparison). According to UNESCO, three times more Western programmes are shown on Soviet television than Soviet programmes are shown in the West. During the international film festivals held in Moscow Soviet cinemas run more films made in the West as against a handful of Soviet films shown in Western countries in the course of years.

On the whole, the Soviet Union has intergovernmental agreements and programmes with 120 countries and the volume of its international cultural ties is far greater than that of other states. No one can fault the Soviet Union for failing to fulfil the relevant provisions of the Final Act.

An entirely different policy with regard to the Helsinki accords is pursued by the present US Administration. In 1980 Washington unilaterally broke off the talks with the Soviet Union on concluding an intergovernmental agreement on exchanges, contacts and cooperation. Since then even those ties making progress have been reduced to naught.

Another adverse factor is the expanding psychological warfare that Washington and other NATO countries are waging against the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries participating in the European Conference. This "psychological warfare" conducted by means of the radio, television, books and films fully extends to cultural field. The Western "idea market" is saturated with anticommunist "literary" lampoons, films, TV programmes; it peddles the "writings" of dissidents rejected by the Soviet people and turned out of the country, and hushes up books by Soviet authors.

A few words should be said about the development of a highly massive channel of human contacts—tourism. In the past decade the scale of tourism, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, has grown notably. More than 35 million foreign tourists have visited the Soviet Union, including more than five million in 1984 alone, a 12-per cent increase over the 1983 figure. The share of tourists from West European countries has been growing especially fast (a 50 per cent increase in 1982-1983). The USSR has elaborated a programme for boosting international tourism even further.

Considerable achievements have been made in resolving a problem that aroused much controversy in the drafting of the Final Act at Helsinki and later at the Belgrade and Madrid meetings. It concerned improved working conditions for journalists and information exchange.

Commenting on the cultural and humanitarian accords reached at Helsinki the West often ignores the widest channels of information exchanges and human contacts and deliberately emphasises other forms that concern a relatively small group of persons. These matters include the reunification of families, travel abroad to visit relatives, regulations concerning such visits, the issue of visas and similar questions. At the Belgrade and Madrid meetings the United States and some of its NATO allies tried to confine the debates not only on "third basket" issues but on the entire Final Act to these narrow issues.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are emphatically opposed to this misinterpretation of the Helsinki accords. Such questions should be decided by the states themselves in accordance with their own laws and regulations. Nevertheless, as a gesture of good will, the Soviet Union has taken a series of decisions to facilitate the settlement of these questions. For instance, it has simplified the procedures involved, has reduced the time during which travel requests are considered and exit visas issued, and has lowered the cost of obtaining the necessary travel documents. Thousands of citizens have emigrated to other countries to be reunited with their families.

A serious obstacle here is the continued attempts by certain groups in the West to use the Final Act accords as a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of the socialist states and for spreading anticommunist propaganda. One report after another has been coming out in Western capitals alleging that the socialist countries have "failed" to comply with the provisions of the Final Act. They distort facts, hurl "accusations" at the socialist countries, and raise a hue and cry over the same few "dissidents". This is done despite the fact that the Final Act is a document regulating interstate relations, and that none of its provisions entitles any state to interfere in the internal affairs of other states. Clearly such actions can only hamper efforts to improve understanding between nations.

To sum up, implementation of the Helsinki understandings has led to a considerable growth of cultural and humanitarian contacts; there have been intensive exchanges in culture, education, information, tourism and contacts between organisations and people. Even in recent years, when aggressive circles in the United States and other NATO countries have worsened the international situation, these contacts have remained at much higher level than during the cold war years. This is an achievement, and it is highly valued by the overwhelming majority of Europeans. These problems will undoubtedly be discussed at the European Cultural Forum to be held in 1985 in Budapest in accordance with the decisions of the Madrid Meeting.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the potentialities inherent in the decisions of the Helsinki Conference and the follow-up meetings are far from being exhausted, and that in future, given mutual will and desire, they will continue to bring benefit to the European peoples and contribute to their spiritual enrichment and cooperation.

As to the Soviet peoples, their desire to have access to the treasure trove of world and European culture shall never abate; they will continue to contribute to the strengthening of goodneighbourly relations and mutual understanding with other countries for the sake of what matters more than anything else today, the preservation of peace on Earth.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

Mass Media

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 102-106

[Article by Kaarle Nordenstreng, professor of journalism and mass communications of the University of Tampere, member of the Board of Governors of the Finnish Institute of International Affairs, president of the International Organization of Journalists]

[Text] "Basket three" of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), entitled Cooperation in Humanitarian and Other Fields, begins with a significant Preamble where the participating states "desiring to contribute to the strengthening of peace and understanding among peoples and to the spiritual enrichment of the human personality" expressed their determination "to cooperate among themselves, irrespective of their political, economic and social systems".

The carefully-worded Preamble constituted at the time one of the most difficult thresholds of the CSCE process, which could be overcome only as part of a "package deal" linking the third basket to the first and envisaging full respect for the principles guiding relations among participating States. In the Preamble of the chapter entitled Information the participating States "conscious of the need for an ever wider knowledge

and understanding of the various aspects of life in other participating States... make it their aim to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds, to encourage cooperation in the field of information and the exchange of information with other countries".

Let us focus attention on the information provided by the mass media to the publics of different countries, as well as on some legal and professional principles underlying communication. To our knowledge there is no comprehensive empirical survey of how well the Helsinki recommendations concerning information have materialised. Therefore our treatment of the problem is guided not so much by the letter as by spirit of the Final Act. Our analysis is based on a number of studies, especially content analyses of newspapers, radio and television. There is no doubt that television is the most important mass media when considering "the need for an ever wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life in other participating States". How is this consciousness-guiding potential used to further the cause of the CSCE?

One answer to this question is provided by a recent UNESCO study on the structure of TV broadcasting in a total of 56 countries, including 27 CSCE countries during a two-week period in early 1983. The results obtained were compared with those from a corresponding study in the early 1970s.

The study shows that American television is as inaccessible to foreign production as it was before Helsinki: imported programmes account for a modest 1-2 per cent of overall transmission time, showing virtually no change compared to ten years ago. However, broadcasting volumes in the USA far exceed those of other countries, and thus even one per cent means a considerable amount when translated into hours. One quarter of imports comes from Great Britain, one fifth from other West European countries— whereas imports from Eastern Europe are negligible.

The general picture in Western Europe is also largely the same today as it was before Helsinki: imported programmes account for an average 30 per cent of broadcasting time, nearly half of which is from the USA. An average 3 per cent of imports are from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; in France and the Federal Republic of Germany 6 or 7 per cent and in Finland 4 per cent. An increase in imports from the East is recorded only for the Federal Republic and the Basque TV in Northern Spain.

Soviet television imported 8 per cent of its programmes in 1983, which is notably more than the five per cent before Helsinki in 1973. A whole 55 per cent of imports was from Western Europe (mostly from the Federal Republic of Germany and France) and 30 per cent from Eastern Europe; the US accounted for 6 per cent of total imports.

Programme statistics in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe have changed as well: there has been a clear increase in the share of imported programmes, in particular from the West. Television in Eastern Europe does generally have a more abundant and versatile supply of material from the West than television in the West does about East European countries.

Although both the USA and the Soviet Union are typically self-sufficient major powers in TV programmes, the TV public in the USA still has access to less material to gain "an ever wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life in other participating States" than the Soviet public: this applies in particular to material about the "counterpart".

The commitment "to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds" has thus remained a dead letter, especially in the West. In this sense there is good reason to reconsider the conventional (Western) notions of an "open" West and "closed" East. It is worth recalling what President Urho Kekkonen remarked on the 1973 UNESCO

study: "Globally the flow of information between states- not least the material pumped out by television- is to a very great extent a one-way, unbalanced traffic, and in no way possesses the depth and range which the principles of freedom of speech require.... These facts make one question the principle of freedom of communication in just the same way as one has had cause to re-evaluate the concept of freedom of speech. Could it be that the prophets who preach unhindered communication are not concerned with equality between nations, but are on the side of the stronger and wealthier?" The press is of course another influential media, especially in the field of politics. The newspaper coverage in April-June 1979 from 1-3 national papers in 29 countries, including 11 CSCE countries, is the topic of another UNESCO study.

Foreign news and other foreign material in all the papers of the CSCE countries usually cover more than 20 per cent of the space, in many cases even more than 50 per cent (the Soviet Union, Poland, Yugoslavia, the Federal Republic of Germany). The major papers in the USA are likewise strikingly international, just like the major papers in, say, Finland or Hungary. Statistics on information flows suggest that, in general, newspapers comply more fully with the Helsinki spirit and letter than television. But upon closer scrutiny of the content of the papers it appears that this question is much more complicated.

This is well illustrated by a comparison of the approaches in Moscow and Washington to the theme of disarmament and the arms race. The study concerned the English-language broadcasts of the Voice of America (VOA) and Radio Moscow (RM) during a one-week period in April this year. In the headlines of both radio stations were CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal for a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, the Geneva talks between the USSR and the USA, "star wars" programme, and the peace movement.

Two completely different pictures emerged from the same basic elements. The VOA says the Soviet proposals for freezing offensive strategic arms and for introducing a moratorium on the creation, testing and deployment of strike space arms are mere propaganda sidetracking the Geneva talks. RM takes the initiative as a gesture of friendship aimed at promoting peace in the world, and expects that the Americans respond. The VOA invests efforts to convincing its listeners that the USA is lagging far behind the Soviets in the arms race, that in terms of nuclear warheads the Soviet Union is eight times stronger than the USA; it quotes foreign papers to support its arguments of a "freeze illusion".

Foreign papers are the main source of reference at RM as well, above all Western papers and statements by Western politicians. The idea it wants to convey is that world public opinion is behind the Soviet initiative and that the American attitude is condemned worldwide. The Western peace movement receives considerable attention in RM as the foremost expression of the public defiance of US pressure, whereas the VOA sarcastically drops hints that the whole movement is a Soviet puppet. "Star wars" is also very much in the background in VOA's reporting, whereas in RM news it is a very central theme.

The fact that the radio stations of the opposing governments convey so different pictures of their security policies is not directly in violation of the Final Act. Yet to be precise the Final Act prompted the participating states to develop mutual understanding and further improvement of their relations. It was quite rightly perceived in Helsinki that information cannot be detached from political development in general.

Nonetheless, the field of communication is still plagued with the cold war atmosphere. Moreover, there is the risk that this situation is exacerbated through the mass media. Well aware what this would mean, former

Ambassador to the USSR George E. Kennan criticised in 1982 the US press for its "endless series of distortions and oversimplifications" and for the "routine exaggeration of Moscow's military capabilities". And Professor of Journalism William Dorman of California State University (Sacramento) concluded in 1983 that despite some promising developments, the American media have for the most part "helped make crisis a permanent aspect of the American consciousness, and to create a garrison state of mind".

At the early stages of the CSCE process détente proceeded despite the reporting in Western quality papers- definitely not thanks to it. After Helsinki the CSCE more or less vanished from the headlines. The quality papers got ever more involved in an ideological battle that indirectly has done much harm to the cause of the CSCE over the past few years.

However, we must extend our analysis beyond this "concrete" communication to the "abstract" level of norms which in the form of political and professional ideologies always in one way or another and more or less consciously guides the practice of communication. The Final Act itself is of great importance at the level of principles, so much so that it may be seen to represent a "new equation" in the normative field of international communication.

The balanced principles concerning communication that were entered in the CSCE Final Act have since been ratified several times- universally. In a number of their resolutions the UN and UNESCO have linked up communication and security in the spirit of the Final Act, sometimes down to its letter. This has probably been motivated by the fact that the Third World has been advocating what is known as a new international order, which happens to closely conform with détente. Claims for a "new international information order" thus also promoted the CSCE principles concerning information and communication.

The most important and most well-known achievement at the normative level of international politics since Helsinki has so far been the Mass Media Declaration (Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Counteracting Racism, Apartheid and Incitement to War) adopted in November 1978 by consensus of UNESCO General Conference. This Declaration is the first document adopted within the UN system that includes a comprehensive definition of the tasks, rights and responsibilities of mass media in the international community.

The greatest merit of the UNESCO Mass Media Declaration is precisely that it places the media- their rights, responsibilities and contents- within the framework of interstate relations and international law. The principle is the same as in the CSCE Final Act, where "basket three" is connected to "basket one".

The CSCE principles of mass communication began to gain ground in professional circles, especially among journalists. This was most convincingly evidenced by the document issued in 1983: International Principles of Professional Ethics in Journalism. The declaration of principles was prepared by international and regional organisations of journalists, representing a total of 400,000 journalists from all corners of the world- from Latin America to ASEAN countries, from catholics to communists. The journalists' declaration is full of the spirit of Helsinki.

A couple of years ago an international movement of journalists for peace was launched, and in September this year Finland will be host of the journalists' own CSCE 10th anniversary.

The years after Helsinki have witnessed changes in the field of information- changes that are parallel with the spirit of Helsinki. However,

progress has mostly been made at the level of professional ethics, the level of values and norms guiding the transmission of information.

By way of contrast, there have been no major changes in the actual information flows or in the content of information. But there would not have been enough time for such changes since Helsinki. The structures of information and communication are relatively stable, and in most cases changes come very slowly. Ten years is after all a rather short time—even in the history of the time-bound mass media.

Whether or not the influence of information has taken us closer to the principles of the Final Act, we can definitely say that over the last 10 years this influence has been a growing one. Information is of ever greater national and international significance in the modern world, and over these years there has been a growing awareness of this. Yet there is also a desire to separate information and communication from the frameworks in which they have been placed in the CSCE and UNESCO documents. Such efforts are however doomed to failure: the growing importance of information has made it a so-called global problem. And a global problem is always bound up with the collective interests of the international community.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

'Fidelity to the Final Act'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 106-108

[Article by Erust-Otto Schwabe, editor-in-chief, HORIZONT monthly (GDR)]

[Text]

PROBABLY every person who was present on August 1, 1975 as a delegate or journalist at the Finlandia Hall during the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe realised the historical significance of this moment both for the present and the future of the peoples and countries of our continent.

Many journalists voiced scepticism concerning the prospects of turning a Europe split as a result of the war into a model of peaceful coexistence. This opinion emerged not in the least for the reason that right until the last moment influential forces in a number of Western countries had been opposing both the Conference itself and the adoption of it of a coordinated document. For this reason it appeared unlikely that they would submit to the will, expressed in the Final Act, of the peoples of the countries participants in the Conference for peace and mutual understanding. Indeed, not even three years passed when the NATO countries adopted in Washington a new large scale arms buildup programme from which the current American plans to militarise outer space in fact emanate.

Certain Western states participants in the Conference have been violating the provisions of the Final Act under different pretexts. The range of means they use is quite wide: from embargos and other impediments to the development of free trade to the revenge-seeking demands of the FRG that borders be re-examined and statements by its top officials about the supposedly "open" German question. Most Western countries patently lag behind in the field of cultural exchange with socialist countries. Many bourgeois media are in effect engaged in psychological warfare against existing socialism. Representatives of capitalist countries are purposely undermining the integrity of the Final Act, emphasising just one of its sections—the observance of human rights. They do not stop at attempts to turn this section into "permission" to engage in counter-revolutionary subversive acts in the socialist world.

Such speculations are facilitated by the circumstance that the public in the Western countries still receives scanty information about the documents adopted during the European Conference, which, incidentally, is also a violation of the Helsinki accords. Whereas in the GDR with a population of 17 million, almost two million copies of the Final Act were circulated, only half of this number went to all the capitalist states participants in the Conference with an aggregate population of 630 million. Only 25,000 copies of the document of the Madrid meeting were issued in the USA, in other words, in a proportion of one copy per 10,000 Americans.

However, the above-mentioned should not lead to the erroneous conclusion that the Final Act cannot serve as a reliable foundation for the creation of a new Europe. Ten years is obviously too short a period to make a final conclusion about such a document designed for a historically long span. Furthermore, even the leading strata of most Western countries participants in the Conference realise today as before the fact that the accords reached during it, specifically the Final Act, are an important political compromise between states belonging to different social systems, a compromise the viability of which has withstood several critical situations of recent years. The peoples have indeed felt the creative force of détente both in the sphere of interstate relations and for each person individually.

To preserve and develop all the positive achievements that have been scored in the development of the European process over the past ten years is an important task of the community of socialist states, the GDR included. We have always proceeded from the belief that it is easier to destroy bridges than build them anew. Like the socialist countries allied to it, the GDR has always viewed the Helsinki Final Act as a single entity and, correspondingly, has acted energetically in implementing all three of its basic sections. As in the process of the drafting of the Final Act, the GDR's approach to aspects of its realisation is determined by the requirement of common sense, due account of the concrete situation and considerations of common benefit. Such a line implies that given a correct interpretation of the principles and provisions of the Act, any striving to obtain unilateral advantages at the expense of other partners is excluded, as are attempts retrospectively to revise individual provisions of the Act which was impossible to do at the drafting stage.

Proceeding from the belief that the ensuring of peace is the elementary prerequisite for any type of cooperation between states with different social systems, in implementing the Final Act, the GDR in alliance with the other socialist countries has always paid particular attention to the so-called "first basket" (Questions Relating to Security in Europe).

This above all applies to the intensification of East-West dialogue and the continued extension of contractual relations among the European states. All told, from 1975 to April 30, 1985 the GDR signed 270 treaties and agreements with capitalist states. If this depended solely on the GDR, the inter-European contractual network would be still broader. However, this is impeded, among other things, by the pressure brought to bear by the ERG on some Western states when it comes to a contractual and legal settlement of various important problems.

Working to implement the provisions of the "second basket" of the Final Act (Cooperation in the Field of Economics, of Science and Technology and of the Environment) the GDR has concluded upwards of 170 treaties and agreements since 1975 on these questions with 20 capitalist states participants in the European Conference.

The GDR has made a considerable contribution to the implementation of the provisions of the "third basket" (Cooperation in Humanitarian and Other Fields). After the Helsinki Conference it signed 73 treaties and

agreements specifically on these questions with 16 capitalist states, including agreements on cultural ties between the GDR Academy of Sciences and its foreign counterparts, and agreements on the development of collaboration in radio and TV broadcasting. Fine working conditions are being provided in this country to the 144 correspondents accredited in the GDR from 37 states, including 48 from capitalist states and West Berlin, as well as the 4-5 thousand foreign correspondents from all parts of the world who visit the GDR annually as tourists.

As to the provisions of the Final Act and subsequent international documents on questions of the reunification of families, marriages between citizens of different countries, etc., they accord with the internal legislation of the GDR, as well as all other principles and recommendations of the European Conference.

On June 17 this year the session of the GDR State Council assessed this country's contribution to the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. Erich Honecker stated that detente was and still is a topical objective, and that the future belongs to this policy, since it alone can ensure people in the East and West alike vital security for today and tomorrow and create an atmosphere of trust among states. In this sense, the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference will continue to be of binding significance for the GDR.

There is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence. This fundamental idea guided the socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union, when, giving vigorous support to Finland and showing the requisite flexibility, they paved the way to the Conference in Helsinki one step at a time. Of course, some of the hopes of ten years ago have not materialised, detente cannot be called the overriding norm in present day international relations. However, this does not change anything in assessing the preconditions for the development of the CSCE process. Complete implementation of all the Helsinki accords remains the priority in the policies of the socialist community.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

'Decisive Factor'

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 108-111

[Article by Prof A. Yazkova, D. Sc. (Hist.), head of sector, Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

THE PAST decade has shown how persistently the socialist countries are countering the policy of undermining detente, building up armaments and raising the level of military confrontation with the policy of promoting international peace and the development of mutually beneficial cooperation in Europe. During the ten years since the signing of the Final Act the Soviet Union and the other European socialist countries have come up with a number of large-scale initiatives aimed at consolidating the positive changes that began in international relations in the 1970s. The concerted actions of the socialist countries are essential here.

It should probably be recollected here that the very holding of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was the result of concerted foreign policy initiatives of the European socialist countries. As early as the 1950s, in the conditions of the cold war unleashed by im-

perialism, the socialist community countries made persistent efforts to lessen international tensions, strengthen security in Europe and promote cooperation among European states. The preamble to the Warsaw Treaty signed 30 years ago in May 1955, noted these countries' striving for the "creation of a collective security system in Europe involving all the European states, irrespective of their social and state system, which would enable them to pool their efforts to ensure peace in Europe". In the 1960s and 1970s the European socialist countries spearheaded the efforts to bring about political détente in Europe. In 1966 the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty at its meeting in Bucharest called for a conference to discuss European security and peaceful cooperation that could result in the creation of a system of collective security in Europe. The socialist countries worked with unflagging energy to realise that proposal. The 1969 Budapest Communique of the Meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee renewed the appeal to all the European countries to convene an international conference on security and cooperation in Europe, and the Prague Declaration of 1972 presented a comprehensive programme for turning the European continent into an area of lasting peace and set out the principles the conference could lie at the bedrock of interstate relations in Europe.

In the 1970s the socialist countries signed a number of important practical agreements with Western powers on fundamental issues of European and world politics. Fruitful bilateral and multilateral contacts, economic agreements and political accords paved the way for détente in Europe. Michael Palmer, a British international affairs scholar, wrote at the time: "Taken together, these talks and initiatives constitute something of a diplomatic revolution and they certainly represent an attempt... to break the European deadlock".

The socialist countries remain the decisive factor in the struggle for restoring détente, strengthening international security and developing cooperation between the states of the two systems in Europe, even today when the international situation has dramatically worsened through the fault of the reactionary imperialist forces. A comprehensive programme for the improvement of the international situation was put forward by the 26th Congress of the CPSU and the Congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the other socialist countries. The need for urgent measures at this dangerous juncture in international development was urged in many collective documents of the socialist community countries, notably, the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty States of January 1983 and the collective document of the CMEA countries On the Maintenance of Peace and International Economic Cooperation (June 1984).

The summit meetings of the Warsaw Treaty in Moscow on March 13 and in Warsaw on April 26, 1985, were milestones in promoting cooperation among the socialist community countries. The joint programme of action agreed upon at these meetings could even today provide a solid foundation for peace in Europe and throughout the world.

The totality of the constructive proposals contained in the collective documents of the Warsaw Treaty and the CMEA and the speeches of the leaders of the socialist countries prompt conclusions essential for the practice of present-day international relations. The foremost of them is that in modern conditions a turn towards normal development of international relations in Europe can be brought about not by building up armaments, a course pursued by the reactionary quarters of the USA and NATO, but by political means that preclude the use of military force or threat of force, i.e. through negotiations.

Another equally important conclusion is the need to halt the arms race. The socialist community countries in their collective documents have

repeatedly stressed the urgency of settling this problem, on the worldwide as well as on the European scale.

Deepening and elaborating the provisions of the Final Act of the European Conference, the socialist countries have proposed to extend confidence measures in the relations between its participants by spreading them not only to the military field, but also to the political one. The proposals of the Warsaw Treaty states made at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe are designed to contribute to the fulfilment of this paramount task.

Reviewing the path covered since the Helsinki Conference, we can say that possibilities for realising the Helsinki accords exist even today. For this to happen, all sides should pursue a policy of realism and business-like interaction. What is needed is serious and equal dialogue between states with different social systems and negotiations which the sides should enter with an awareness of their responsibility and a desire to achieve positive results.

Addressing the British Parliament in December 1984 Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union was prepared for the negotiations aimed at improving international relations. There is always room for sensible compromises in politics and diplomacy, a vast field for promoting and strengthening mutual understanding and confidence on the basis of similar or identical interests, he stressed, pointing out that the preservation of peace should be the main thrust of such cooperation.

As regards the Warsaw Treaty states, they are prepared to develop peaceful dialogue with other states in the spirit of goodwill and confidence and to develop extensive international interaction for the sake of safeguarding universal peace and security, as was stated in the communique issued by the meeting of top party and state leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries held in Warsaw to mark its 30th anniversary.

If one examines the most important initiatives recently proposed by the Soviet Union, and the Warsaw Treaty as a whole, one is bound to conclude that their realisation would go a long way towards improving the international situation and restoring and deepening detente. One speaks first and foremost of the need for all nuclear powers to follow the Soviet example and pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries also believe that it is necessary:

- to freeze the nuclear arsenals of all nuclear powers initially the USSR and the USA quantitatively and qualitatively in order to immediately pass over to reduction of these weapons until their ultimate elimination;

- to sign a treaty on mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of the relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries, between all the participants in the CSCE;

- to agree on a general and complete ban on nuclear weapons tests;

- to sign an international convention to ban and eliminate the barbarous chemical weapons of mass destruction.

The danger posed to the whole world and especially to Europe by the plans of militarising outer space currently put forward by the US Administration should also be mentioned. In April 1985, the top party and state leaders of the Warsaw Treaty meeting in Warsaw laid special emphasis on the need to prevent the militarisation of outer space along with a drastic reduction of nuclear armaments. This view, which the Soviet Union has brought to the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, is backed by all Warsaw Treaty states. And it is also shared by many West European political leaders, as was revealed during an intensive exchange of opinions held recently during the meetings between Soviet and West European (Willy Brandt, Bruno Kreisky and others) political leaders.

The Soviet decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and on other countermeasures in Europe until November this year met with understanding and backing among the European public at large. There is no doubt that if the United States, too, shows restraint in the matter of deploying its missiles in Europe this will be a constructive step towards stronger European peace.

Thus, the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty remain the initiators and vigorous proponents of the policy of safeguarding peace and security in Europe.

Today, like ten years ago, the socialist countries highly assess the significance of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. At its Plenary Meeting this April the Central Committee of the CPSU stressed that the interstate documents of the detente period, including the Helsinki Final Act, have not lost their relevance. They are an example of how international relations can be shaped if the sides are guided by the principles of equality and equal security and the existing world realities, not seeking to gain any advantages but working towards mutually acceptable decisions and understandings.

In this year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over German fascism it is important to note that by drawing a line under the Second World War the European Conference formalised the right of European peoples to lasting peace. In the long historical perspective there is no way back from Helsinki, nor can there ever be one. That is why all attempts to bring Europe back to the times of the cold war are doomed to failure. The world, and Europe in particular, are witnessing important changes and the emergence of new phenomena that are transforming the existing structure of international relations in the direction indicated by the European Conference.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

Hungarian Newspaper Editor Comments

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 111-113

[Article by Jozsef Czászi, deputy editor-in-chief, newspaper MAGYAR HIRLAP]

[Text]

THE SIGNING of the Final Act crowned the efforts that the socialist countries had taken to put an end to the cold war and inaugurate the process of strengthening security and cooperation in Europe. The Final Act is first and foremost a tremendous success of the Leninist peace policy of the Soviet Union. It signifies a shift of the policy of peaceful coexistence consistently pursued by the socialist countries to the sphere of practical application. In coming out for peace the socialist countries proceed from the belief that the recognition of and respect for the borders and territorial realities that have taken shape after the Second World War is the basis of peace and cooperation in Europe. The Helsinki Conference confirmed the historic veracity of this course.

The failure of the cold war policy and the spread of the ideas of collective security in Europe became possible as a result of a change in the alignment of forces since the latter half of the 1960s, which sounded as the death toll for this policy. The changes that have taken place in the world helped invigorate realistically minded circles in the leading capitalist countries which were prepared to cooperate with the socialist countries and build relations with them on a contractual basis. But for these processes to begin in Europe and to prepare for the Helsinki Conference it was also imperative to recognise that the opposing sides would not be able to overcome one another without the risk of their own destruction,

and that by changing the relations existing between them they could alter the entire structure and atmosphere of international affairs.

Alongside unprecedentedly wide-scale bilateral diplomatic activity before the Helsinki Conference the matter of building up confidence was largely promoted by the collective proposals of the socialist countries formulated by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty in Bucharest in July 1966, and later in Budapest in March 1969.

The spread of the idea of security and cooperation in Europe was also furthered by the fact that the socialist countries were able to evoke interest among the NATO countries in holding such a European conference on the basis of recognition that cooperation among European countries cannot be effective and long-term if the USA and Canada are excluded from it. Preparations for the Helsinki Conference were also facilitated by such historically important aspects of the implementation of détente as the Soviet-American agreements concluded in 1972 (including the SALT-I Treaty), as well as the normalisation of relations between the FRG and the socialist countries on the basis of recognition of the realities that had taken shape after the Second World War. These positive changes were mirrored in the Final Act.

The socialist countries believe that the principles and provisions of the Final Act should become the fundamental laws of international affairs. Upholding this document, we have had to fight, from the outset, against the attempts of Western representatives to discredit the ideas of Helsinki. The socialist countries have opposed an incorrect interpretation of the process of cooperation and security in Europe and of détente altogether, against the claim that they promote the interests of the socialist countries alone, and against statements that the path to Helsinki is a "one way street" profitable only to the socialist countries. The socialist countries rejected the selective interpretation of the provisions formulated in Helsinki and their arbitrary selection, as well as the clumsy attempts to act as arbiters on the part of those who began a propaganda campaign around "human rights" and wanted to use the Final Act to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries.

The socialist countries have utilised their bilateral and multilateral political and diplomatic ties to advance the process of European détente and to promote cooperation among states in environmental protection, transportation, power engineering, culture, and last but not least, spread détente to the military sphere. At the meetings in Belgrade and Madrid they took a constructive stand and at present are striving through their initiatives to further the success of the Stockholm conference on measures to boost trust and promote security and disarmament in Europe.

The events of the past decade have graphically illustrated that the Western countries, particularly the USA, have not only not shown a similar readiness for applying the principles elaborated in Helsinki but are patently intent on putting the brakes on the development of interstate ties. Instead of removing the old barriers they are creating fresh impediments to economic and scientific and technological ties between the socialist and capitalist countries. The ruling quarters of the USA and NATO are set on opposing the initiatives of the socialist countries which are aimed at supplementing political détente with military détente.

The US Administration that came to office in 1981 continued to develop this course, buttressing it with unprecedented armaments programmes aimed at rapidly developing all elements of the strategic triad and first-strike weapons, the so-called European arsenal and at making outer space an arena of the arms race.

In the current tense international situation which is fraught with serious danger, the socialist countries have repeatedly stated that the Helsinki traditions place obligations upon all the signatories to the final docu-

ment. In this connection they are striving with greater determination than ever to implement the accords adopted in the Finnish capital and elaborate effective measures that would reduce the level of military confrontation.

When the defensive alliance of the socialist countries the Warsaw Treaty was extended on April 26, 1985, in the Polish capital, the leaders of the fraternal countries not only spoke out in favour of multifarious cooperation for the further consolidation of the defensive capability of the members of this alliance, but also reaffirmed the fact that they do not seek to attain military superiority and will not allow anyone to attain it over them. True to the spirit of the Final Act, the socialist countries have advocated a parity of forces at the lowest level. Their foreign policy stand is constructive—they promptly react to each positive step by the other side and do not miss a single opportunity for cementing detente.

In this jubilee year of the Helsinki Conference, we, citizens of the Hungarian People's Republic, recall with gratification the fact that in the spring of 1969 this country played an important role in the preparations for the European Conference. "The People's Republic of Hungary," reads an information bulletin issued by the Plenary Meeting of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Central Committee held on July 26, 1985, "consistently fulfils the recommendations of the Final Act and, in its foreign policy activity, strives to preserve and consolidate the results attained in Helsinki."

An important event is to take place in Budapest this coming October—the Cultural Forum. This is the first conference of its kind to be held in a socialist country. Together with its allies, Hungary is doing everything it can to promote security and cooperation in Europe and is also developing relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence with countries which have a different social system. The fact that we take an active part in shaping and pursuing the foreign policy of the socialist states widens the channels of the country's diplomatic activities and broadens the horizons of its foreign policy. It is a component of the socialist community both in bilateral relations and at international level.

**COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985
English translation Progress Publishers 1985**

Final Word From Editors

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 113-115

[Text] *From the Editors.* The participants in the exchange of opinion dwell on the wide range of problems; they brought out once more the intransigent significance of the convocation of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, a milestone of postwar European history that was the high point of the process of detente and marked the establishment of the principles of peaceful coexistence in the development of international relations on the European continent. The Helsinki Conference crowned the sustained efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the peace-loving public and sober-thinking politicians in the West aimed at ridding Europe of the threat of a new world war, making it a continent of stable peace and mutually beneficial cooperation among European states, in the first place the states belonging to different social systems. The Conference also imparted a powerful impetus to advance along the road towards stronger peace and security of the European peoples, to broader ties and interaction among the nations and states of the continent in the political, economic and cultural fields.

If the trends reflected in the Final Act of the Conference had been comprehensively developed in the following years, the threat of war would have been much more remote than it is today. Moreover, the forces seeking to whip up the arms race and put the socialist countries and the whole world under the Damocles' sword of the nuclear menace would hardly have been able to realise their sinister plans.

The record has shown, however, that such an outlook as was justly stressed by the contributors to the discussion did not suit those who were directed in their foreign policy by the desire to achieve imperial domination, by enmity to communism, and by anti-Sovietism. The policy of detente has come under fierce attacks from the more reactionary and conservative quarters. As a result of the actions undertaken in recent years by the American leadership in order to overturn what had made Europe an arena of detente, the clouds of war are again thickening over Europe. The Washington leaders are turning West European countries into outposts for their adventurist plans and their peoples into nuclear hostages. The USA is doing everything it can to stir among the West Europeans feelings of chauvinism, of fear in the face of a mythical "Soviet menace", mistrust, hostility and hatred between the European nations. The contributors to the discussion had every ground to note that the USA would like to see a Europe split into hostile camps, a situation in which it is easier to keep the North Atlantic bloc partners in check, to impose its will on them, to manipulate their foreign policies.

At the same time, experience, including the experience of recent years, has shown that the European process that began thanks to the constructive initiatives of the socialist countries about 20 years ago, is a sufficiently stable phenomenon and that the peoples of the European countries do not want to relinquish the positive gains associated in their minds with detente. West European public opinion is alarmed and outraged by the militaristic policy of Washington and its desire to subjugate Western Europe politically and economically and to harness it to US military adventures.

This is evidenced above all by the unprecedented antiwar movement that has swept West European countries today. Despite all the attempts to dampen this movement through police reprisals, political intrigues and sabotage, the movement is gaining momentum, involving ever new social groups and strata. The movement's slogans are in many ways similar to the ideals reflected in the Helsinki Final Act. Detente in the military field, along with restraining war preparations and ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, is becoming an imperative in the present international situation when the arms race, prodded on by Washington has assumed truly monstrous proportions and actually is bringing the world to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe. The antiwar movement today is a key political factor in West European countries which their ruling circles cannot afford to ignore.

Everything that has, despite the danger for the cause of peace posed by the actions of the US and NATO militarist circles, stood fast and taken root in the practice of relations between peoples and states can serve as the basis for the constructive continuation of detente, leading to a reliable and all-encompassing system of European and international security. The contributors to the exchange of views have demonstrated that the decisive force towards revival and preservation of the policy of detente, now as in the past, are the socialist states. In accordance with the Peace Programme worked out by the Congresses of the CPSU, the Soviet Union continues persistently and consistently to put forward initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race, freeing Europe and the world of the threat of a new world war, strengthening the security of nations and establishing mutually beneficial and equal links among all the states, at solving acute international problems through negotiations and political dialogue. The implementation of the clear-cut, concrete and far-reaching Soviet proposals would undoubtedly bring about a dramatic improvement in the situation in Europe and indeed in the whole world. This course enjoys the backing of the other socialist countries which have formulated in their collective documents a realistic and constructive platform for improving the inter-

national situation, for consolidating and developing the European process. It meets with approval and understanding on the part of the world public at large.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are convinced that the experience of fruitful and mutually beneficial cooperation has not gone for naught, and sentiments in favour of the constructive continuation of the European process will cement on the continent. However, the resurgence of détente does not mean a mere return to what was achieved in the 1970s. Détente is not an end in itself, it is merely a necessary, but transitional stage from a world overburdened by weapons to a reliable and comprehensive system of international security. As the Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Peoples, Parliaments and Governments of All Countries on the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the End of World War II has stressed, mankind can and must have confidence in its future as it lives through the end of the 20th century and enters the 21st century.

The Editorial Board expresses its sincere appreciation to all those who took part in this exchange of opinion.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985

English translation Progress Publishers 1985

/9274

CSO: 1812/037

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

ANTIDUMPING LEGISLATION CRITICIZED

Moscow FOREIGN TRADE in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 36-40

[Article by Stanislav Otreshko and Alexandr Poluektov: "Anti-Dumping Legislation as an Instrument for Protecting Imperialist Monopolies' Interests"]

[Text]

The end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s were characterized by the growing protectionism of the imperialist states. The protracted deterioration of the macroeconomic situation and the deep-going structural disproportions in the Western powers' economies draw their governments more and more into the "management" of foreign trade and into the struggle to protect the national companies against foreign competition on the home market and ensure favourable conditions for them on foreign markets, thereby disproving their own declarations about their adherence to free trade.

At the same time there is an increase in the range of foreign policy measures used by the imperialist powers to protect national markets from the competition of foreign goods. As a result of several rounds of talks on mutual cuts in customs duties, within GATT, the importance of tariffs as a means of foreign trade regulation has decreased (according to the GATT Secretariat, by 1987 the average weighted level of import taxation in the industrial capitalist countries will have dropped from 7.2 per cent to 4.9 per cent). If this is so, increasingly important become the so-called non-tariff means of import regulation which include a wide range of protectionist measures of an administrative and economic nature.

Anti-dumping legislation is a highly effective instrument of import containment more and more widely applied in the trade of the leading capitalist states. Authorized government bodies use it as a basis for investigations with a view to gathering evidence of the

facts of selling imported goods on the home market of a particular country at dumping prices and for fixing anti-dumping duties.

Anti-dumping legislation as an instrument to protect national industries against foreign companies' competition was adopted in several countries as early as the beginning of the century.¹ Generalizing dumping as a wide-spread method of exporting goods at low prices, as is practised by capitalist companies or their associations with the aim of suppressing competition and winning new sales markets, Lenin noted that "... within a given country the cartel sells its goods at high monopoly prices, but sells them abroad at a much lower price to undercut the competitor, to enlarge its own production to the utmost, etc."² Imperialist monopolies are capable of incorporating such a practice by redistributing the profits from their commercial transactions, since "the cartels limit production for the home market but expand it for the foreign market, selling their goods abroad at a loss and extracting monopoly prices from consumers in their own country."³ In today's economic conditions sales on a foreign market at prices lower than production costs are possible even for relatively small companies owing to the active financial support of the capitalist state which allocates appreciable resources to finance exports.

The growing application of anti-dumping duties, however, is connected not only with the intensified use of dumping in the present competition of capitalist companies on the world market. Anti-dumping measures are also used by advanced capitalist countries for protecting the interests of their national companies which prove unable to adapt themselves to the new conditions of competition on the world market. Governments of the developed capitalist states mostly prefer to neutralize the price advantages of the most competitive imported goods by means of anti-dumping measures. It is indicative that here the matter turns on the damage being done to this or that industry rather than to the interests of the entire country or its economy as a whole. Thus the official circles of capitalist countries show themselves as protectors of their own big capital, when they block the import of cheaper goods and compel the consumers to buy home-produced goods at high monopoly prices. What is more, the imperialist powers are imposing anti-dumping measures on ever wider scales.

Up to the end of the 1960s the anti-dumping laws enacted in the developed capitalist countries markedly differed in many respects, including the interpretation of the very term "dumping" and also with respect to the rules of conducting anti-dumping investigations. The differences in the nature of anti-dumping laws (it should be noted that in a number of industrial capitalist countries such laws did not exist at all) were also manifest in individual countries' dissimilar approaches to the policy in this area.

Paradoxically enough that such a situation in anti-dumping regulation in the developed capitalist countries has arisen despite special Art. VI in GATT defining the basic criteria for applying anti-dumping duties. According to this article, dumping means a situation in which "products of one country are introduced into commerce of another country at less than the normal value of the products," i.e. the price for a similar product realized on the home market of the exporting country. Moreover, in Art. VI it is stated that only that kind of dumping is subject to condemnation which causes or threatens to cause material damage to production or substantially holds back the setting up of local industries.⁴

The provisions of Art. VI of GATT, however, failed to markedly influence the anti-dumping practices of the developed capitalist countries. The main reason for the GATT's low efficacy as concerns anti-dumping measures is in the reservation made when preparing the very text of the General Agreement on its non-application to the trade legislation adopted previously in the signatory countries. Naturally, this reservation was also applicable to the anti-dumping measures legislatively introduced previously despite the fact that in most participating countries they in one way or another contradicted Art. VI of GATT.

This circumstance as well as the noticeably expanded application of anti-dumping measures have made the developed capitalist countries take steps that should establish a certain discipline in anti-dumping practices. With this aim the participants in the trade talks held in 1964-1967 within GATT and known as the Kennedy Round worked out an anti-dumping code, which is an extended interpretation of Art. VI of GATT, with a view to providing a legal basis for its common interpretation and uniformity in applying anti-dumping measures by the participating countries.

An important provision of this code was that in accordance with Art. III anti-dumping duties could only be imposed after establishing the fact that the dumping imports were the main reason for the material damage done to this or that national industry or the principal impediment to its creation. Moreover, in marking a decision the administrative bodies had to compare the damage caused by the dumped imports and the damage due to all the other factors which "may be adversely affecting the industry." Simultaneously, the decision had to be based "on facts, and not merely on allegation, conjecture or remote possibility."⁵

This code, however, was relatively short-lived. In the course of the next multilateral trade talks within GATT held in 1973-1979, a whole series of agreements was worked out which for the first time internationally regulated such non-tariff measures as procedures for import licensing, conditions for government purchases, the rules of evaluation for customs purposes, and so on. Among these arrangements was the Agreement on the interpretation and application of Arts. VI, XVI and XXIII of GATT (the so-called agreement on subsidies and compensatory tariffs), which also determined the interpretation of Art. VI.

Formally it was deemed necessary to bring the provisions of the 1967 Anti-Dumping Code into accord with the provisions of the new agreement. There were, however, other, more deep-rooted reasons for the revision of the original text of the Anti-Dumping Code. The most important of them were the acute economic problems the capitalist economy was facing in the 1970s. First, the deep-going cyclic and structural crises hitting the world capitalist economy in that period were powerful stimulators of the steep rise in protectionist tendencies among the developed capitalist states, which circumstance, in turn, necessitated the elaboration of a new legal "substantiation" for these tendencies. The Anti-Dumping Code with its rather clear-cut requirements as concerns the proof of dumping and the related "material damage" no longer corresponded to the enhanced requirements for the application of such an effective protectionist measure as anti-dumping tariffs.

Second, over the years that had elapsed since the adoption of this Agreement the more industrially developed newly free states had become more and more confident on the world market. Drawing on up-to-date

technology and cheap manpower, these states managed to start mass production of labour-intensive goods (clothes, footwear, textile articles), which in quality and especially in terms of price began to successfully compete with local goods on the markets of the industrial capitalist countries. Somewhat later added to these goods were such relatively sophisticated articles as TV sets, radios, tape-recorders, electronic watches. Moreover, the export of the latter goods to the Western markets increased so rapidly that it often affected such a recognized leader as Japan.

It is these circumstances that were responsible for the appearance of a new, revised Anti-Dumping Code now officially referred to as the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the GATT. The changed situation on the world capitalist market was also seen in the provisions of the newly adopted multilateral agreement on anti-dumping measures.

The innovations introduced mainly concerned the deletion of the provision to the effect that anti-dumping tariffs should only be imposed after establishing the fact that dumping imports were the main reason for material damage or for the threat of it to this or that industry. In the new agreement this provision (which repeats the corresponding article in the agreement on subsidies and compensatory tariffs) no longer requires proof. There is no provision either on the commensurability of the damage due to dumping imports with the adverse effect of all the other factors. In actual fact, this means that for a non-competitive company whose sales on the home market have declined due to purely internal reasons (the crisis state of the economy, technological lagging, miscalculations in business affairs, etc.) it is sufficient to indicate even an indirect connection between the dumping and the material damage for the mechanism of anti-dumping investigation to start operating.

Besides, in the new Anti-Dumping Code there is practically no definition of "material damage," a notion of great importance for an anti-dumping investigation. Instead of a clear-cut formulation the text points out only a few factors which should be taken into account when assessing the damage, including (1) the volume of dumping imports; (2) the prices of the dumped products and their influence on the prices of local goods; (3) influence of the said imports on national industries as regards the loading of production ca-

capacities, the share of the home market, profits, employment, etc. As a result, the administrative bodies responsible for investigation are given sufficiently ample opportunities to find which imports are and which are not detrimental to national manufacturers. As noted by one of the investigators of EEC anti-dumping legislation, the limits for the application of such a formula are difficult to determine in practice, and in the absence of a clear resolution on this question the Commission of the European Communities has ample opportunity to operate at its own discretion.⁶

Clearly, it was this wording of the Agreement that met the requirements of state-monopoly capitalism concerned at the growing competition on the world capitalist market and striving to have a freer hand in conducting anti-dumping investigations.

Thus, the new anti-dumping Agreement has in fact broadened the possibilities for the capitalist countries to apply anti-dumping measures. As for the other important task of the Agreement, namely, measures to regulate the application of anti-dumping tariffs by unifying the anti-dumping laws of the signatory countries, some progress has been achieved, and yet the problem has not been fully resolved.

Under Art. 16.6 of the Agreement, the participating countries are obliged to bring their anti-dumping laws into accord with its provisions. In other words, the signatories to the Agreement had to adopt laws which would strike out the obsolete articles and replace them by new ones agreed multilaterally. This, however, did not prevent the principal signatories to the Agreement from retaining in their new national anti-dumping laws and regulations certain differences in the interpretation of its provisions. More than that, many deviations from the Agreement are openly protectionist. For instance, the US Trade Agreements Act of 1979, which sets out in part the rules of anti-dumping procedures, proceeds from the premise that the size of the anti-dumping tariff should be fixed independently of the size of the damage due to the dumping. Under this act, whatever the damage established from an investigation, the size of anti-dumping tariff should in all cases be maximal, i.e., equal to the full difference between the so-called normal price and the dumping price.

Another example illustrating the differences in the interpretation of the Agreement, which are nonetheless aimed at achieving one goal (the more effective appli-

cation of anti-dumping duties for protectionist purposes), is the specificity of present-day anti-dumping legislation in Canada, in which emphasis is laid on the preliminary imposition of duties (i.e., before the completion of an investigation).

As for EEC anti-dumping legislation, for all the alluring declarations of the Community's leaders about their desire to create more favourable conditions for exports from the developing countries and in defiance of Art. 13 of the anti-dumping Agreement, it contains no reference to preferential conditions for the developing nations concerning the application of anti-dumping duties.

It is sufficiently clear that behind all these, at first sight theoretical questions, stand the material interests of the monopolies insisting on (and, as a rule, obtaining) all-round support from their governments in the competition on the world market. It would, however, be wrong to treat as absolute the actions of the administrative bodies in the capitalist countries to protect their national manufacturers. Side by side with the growing number of anti-dumping inquiries and the ensuing imposition of duties or the dictation of agreements on the "voluntary" restriction of exports, there are numerous cases when petitions for measures against foreign suppliers are declined. In taking a decision, the government bodies cannot but reckon that with the exceptional tension in trade and economic relations between the imperialist powers any new protectionist measure may entail retaliatory actions, the outbreak of another trade conflict or the curtailment of access to foreign markets. Moreover, certain business circles, interested in retaining and expanding their external economic ties and winning new sales markets, also exert pressure on the government so that the latter take more pragmatic decisions. Nor can the fact be ignored that the operation of the anti-dumping Agreement as concerns disputes between its participants is conducive towards trade compromises which in turn help stop the introduction of anti-dumping tariffs.

Despite the above, the growing competition on the world market with the new Agreement on anti-dumping now in force has created a situation in which the UNCTAD Secretariat has come to the conclusion that "there is every likelihood, therefore, that the number of anti-dumping measures will increase considerably."⁷ This conclusion was proved true very quickly.

The end of the 1970s and the early 1980s in international trade were notable for the unprecedentedly wide scope of anti-dumping investigations in the USA and other developed capitalist countries. While between 1968 and 1978 the administrative bodies in these countries instituted 581 inquiries, in the three years from 1979 to 1982 their number rose to 824. In 1982 alone, 405 anti-dumping inquiries were started in the industrial capitalist countries.⁸ Investigations into export dumping and financing started by the authorities of capitalist countries in 1979-1982, distributed according to the groups of exporting countries, were as follows:

	1979	1980	1981	1982
Industrial capitalist countries	98	119	71	291
Developing nations	17	28	26	75
European socialist countries	8	7	33	27

Source: UNCTAD Document TD/B/979, 1984, p. 5.

As can be seen from the above table, the greatest number of inquiries was instituted in the trade conducted between the industrial capitalist countries themselves; slightly less than 20 per cent of them were against exports from the developing countries, and only about 10 per cent—against exports from the European socialist countries. In 1984, of the 204 inquiries instituted in the industrial capitalist countries 63 per cent concerned their mutual trade, 19 per cent—exports from the developing countries, and 12 per cent—exports from the European socialist countries.⁹

At the same time the above data on the application of anti-dumping measures by the developed capitalist countries do not give a complete picture of the actual orientation of inquiries against individual groups of countries. Comparison of these figures to the volumes of imports for the corresponding period reveals other tendencies in the anti-dumping procedures applied by the industrial capitalist states.

In the USA, for instance, between 1979 and 1982 anti-dumping procedures were most actively applied against the EEC countries: the proportion of inquiries instituted against them was more than three times as large as their share in US imports. For the European socialist countries with their relatively small volume of

exports to the USA the ratio of similar indicators is 140 per cent.

In the EEC we witness a different picture. The Community's anti-dumping measures are spearheaded against the socialist countries: the proportion of anti-dumping inquiries instituted against them in 1979-1982 is nearly ten times as high as their share in EEC imports. Second place goes to the developing non-oil exporter countries where such a comparison shows a more than fivefold increase. The EEC bodies showed the most equitable attitude towards American goods.

Thus, in the EEC and on the US market goods from the socialist countries are given the toughest and most biased treatment as concerns anti-dumping regulations. If we take into account the fact that the bulk of exports from the socialist countries in their trade with the EEC and the USA consists of primary goods and energy carriers free from anti-dumping or compensatory tariffs, then the protectionist orientation of these measures against the finished articles originating from the socialist countries will become even more evident. The reason for this lies, perhaps, not only in the opposition of certain circles in the industrial capitalist countries to the expansion of equitable trade and economic relations with the socialist states, but also in the methodologically incorrect premise being used in inquiries against the imports from these states. It should be noted that the very fact of such inquiries is a certain impediment to the development of mutual trade.

The explanation to Art. VI contained in Annex I to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade points out that in the case of imports from a country which has "monopoly of its trade and where all domestic prices are fixed by the State,... a strict comparison with domestic prices in such a country may not always be appropriate."¹⁰

Experience has shown that relying on this provision the administrative bodies conducting inquiries with a view to determining the "normal" value of a commodity originating from a socialist country select a similar commodity from a capitalist country (theoretically this country should be selected with due regard for the comparability of its level of economic development with the level of the given socialist country). The value of this commodity manufactured by a capitalist enterprise is taken as the basis for calculating the size of the anti-dumping tariff. It is quite obvious that such an

approach presupposes that enterprises operating under the socialist system of economy cannot turn out products at more competitive prices than their capitalist rivals. Thus it follows that by virtue of this practice goods from the socialist countries cannot be sold on the markets of capitalist countries at lower prices than their analogues made in countries with a market economy.

Disregarding the fact that the selection of countries for purposes of comparison is often illogical, the very methodology chosen ignores the advantages due to centralized economic management. These include, in particular, the supply of socialist industrial enterprises with relatively cheaper raw materials, semi-finished products and electricity at prices fixed by the state and free from speculative fluctuations. This methodology does not take account of the possibilities of the planned economy in organizing large-batch production which appreciably reduces relative costs and which is beyond the powers of most capitalist enterprises. Moreover, the centralized sales the socialist countries conduct on foreign markets also make it possible to conclude foreign trade transactions with greater economy and effectiveness than those concluded by private capitalist firms. It is no mere chance, therefore, that of the total number of inquiries conducted in 1979-1982 against products from the socialist countries nearly three-quarters ended in the refusal of imposing anti-dumping tariffs. For the goods from industrial capitalist countries and developing states these proportions are 30 per cent and 46 per cent respectively.

The logic of behaviour and purposes of imperialist monopolies are alien to socialist foreign trade organizations which see their task not in fighting for profits at all cost or in undermining the positions of national companies in other countries, but in developing mutually advantageous trade in every possible way, in realizing the plans for the delivery of goods requisite for the national economy. As noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, "our economic relations with other countries must, to a still greater degree, meet the needs of the national economy for equipment, technologies, primary goods and other materials, and the population's demand for consumer goods."¹¹

The capitalist economy demonstrates its inability of adapting itself to the new conditions on the world market, which have arisen under the influence of objective processes in the international division of labour. And

since among the reasons responsible for today's acute problems in the economic life of the capitalist world there are basically factors of a long-term nature, no attenuation of anti-dumping measures on the part of the developed capitalist countries can be expected. It seems that in the near future these measures will become an important element of the industrial capitalist states' trade policies. This situation calls for the socialist nations' closer unity in their struggle for normal international trade relations, and for their even more lively trade policy aimed at protecting these countries' lawful trade interests and observing the principle of mutual advantage in developing their trade relations with the industrial capitalist states.

¹ In Australia, for instance, the act on Australian industry protection was adopted in 1906, in the USA the Anti-Dumping Act originally came into effect in 1916; in Canada the appropriate legislation has been in force since 1904.

² V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, 1974, Vol. 22, p. 290.

³ *Ibid.*, Moscow, 1977, Vol. 4, p. 202.

⁴ GATT, *Basic Instruments and Selected Documents*, Vol. IV, "Text of the General Agreement", Geneva, 1956, p. 10.

⁵ GATT, *Basic Instruments and Selected Documents*, 15th Supplement, Geneva, 1968, pp. 26-27.

⁶ C. Stanbrook, *Dumping: a Manual on the EEC Anti-Dumping Law and Procedure*, European Business Publications, 1980, p. 28.

⁷ UNCTAD, Document TD/B/778, 1980, p. 18.

⁸ UNCTAD Document. *Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duty Practices*, TD/B/979, 1984.

⁹ Based on UNCTAD Document TD/B/1039, 1985, pp. 22, 23.

¹⁰ GATT, *Basic Instruments and Selected Documents*, Vol. IV, "Text of the General Agreement", p. 64.

¹¹ *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1981, p. 139.

COPYRIGHT: "Vneshnyaya trgovlya" 1985
English translation, "Foreign Trade", 1985

/9274

CSO: 1812/36

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

IMPERIALISM'S INFLUENCE ON DEVELOPING NATIONS ATTACKED

Moscow POLITICHESKOYE SAMOOBRAZOVANIYE in Russian No 9, Sep 85 pp 94-101

[Article by A. Ivanov under the heading, "On International Topics": "Anti-sovietism--the Weapon of Neocolonialism and Expansionism"; passages in all capital letters rendered in boldface in text]

[Text] The destruction of Nazi fascism and Japanese militarism with the decisive role of the Soviet Union created favorable conditions for a radical change in the world political picture. Relying on the assistance and support of world socialism, and the workers' and communist movement, the nations of Asia and Africa, the Caribbean Basin and Oceania have achieved political independence in a stubborn struggle with imperialism, and have found state sovereignty. More than 100 young nation states have been formed on the ruins of former colonial empires.

Of course their development has not and is not proceeding smoothly; it has known and knows its ebbs and flows, achievements and failures. The developing nations are still faced with solving very difficult problems--both those inherited from their colonial past, and those spawned by the policy of neocolonialism. But the mainstream trend lies in the fact that the new nation states are playing an ever more noticeably progressive role in world politics. The development of the entire world depends on how the fate of these countries is shaped, and how the more developed states will build their relations with them.

The forces of imperialism and international reaction have not acquiesced to the loss of direct political control over the fates of the nations who have won national independence. The documents of the fraternal parties frequently stress--and this was once again declared at the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum--that imperialism is trying to "take social revenge along the very broadest front: both in its relations with the socialist commonwealth, against the countries which have been freed from the colonial yoke; and against the national liberation movements and the workers in the capitalist states."

Striving to demoralize and split the revolutionary forces, the ideologues of imperialism operate via the most varied channels. In a never-ending and ever-increasing stream of anticommunist publications, in thousands of hours of subtle radio and television propaganda, Marxist-Leninist teachings on

national and colonial questions, the international activities of the Leninist party, the role of domestic and foreign factors in the establishment and development of young states with a socialist orientation, and the friendly relations and cooperation of the USSR with the developing nations, are again and again subjected to crude distortions and falsifications. A separate trend, which has come to be known as "tropical sovietology" has taken shape within modern anticommunism; it is chiefly concerned with falsified "findings" in the realm of the Soviet Union's relations with the liberated countries and in spreading slander about the CPSU's policy in the area of the national liberation struggle. All of this is openly in the service of the imperialist policy of neocolonialism.

The collapse of the colonial system, and the powerful rise of the peoples' struggle for true independence and social progress, and the objective convergence of the struggle for freedom and democracy with the struggle for socialism has presented the ruling circles of the imperialist powers with a great number of difficult problems, and has forced them to come to grips with the new realities of world development. Since the end of the 1950's, preserving the basis of the capitalist system was inconceivable beyond actively influencing the ideological processes in the young states, and strengthening the positions of the social exponents of the pre-imperialist course of social development. This, naturally, required the requisite efforts of all links of the bourgeois propaganda apparatus, especially that portion which specializes in the problems of developing countries.

Professional "sovietologists" are trying to present the USSR's policy toward Afro-Asian countries at a given moment as if it is devoid of any sort of long-term strategic foundation. They perceive the nature of such a policy, in particular, in some kind of "contradictory" views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the national-colonial question and on problems of the national-liberation movement, and their attitude toward them as if they were only a question of tactics. Such a point of view is supported by J. Commins, R. Leventhal, T. Henriksen, K. Edelman and other anticommunist "experts". For the sake of tactics, they say, even the fundamentals of Marxist theory were distorted. Hence the "inconsistency" of the CPSU with respect to the national-liberation movement--from its "universal support to complete abandonment".

Striving to split the unity of world socialism and the national-liberation movement, bourgeois ideologues make use of the most varied "arguments"--from primitive anticommunist fabrications to subtle liberal-reformist and leftist radical distortions of Marxist-Leninist teachings. Their general premise, which is the basis of all contemporary anticommunist propaganda, is consciously glossing over or the crudest possible falsification of the ideological-theoretical heritage of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

It is, however, an irrefutable fact that the founders of scientific communism always took notice of the interconnection between the proletarian struggle for victory in the socialist revolution in the industrial developed countries, and the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of the East. As early as 1853, in his article "The Future Results of British Dominion in India," Marx pointed out that, "The people of India cannot reap

the mature fruit of those elements of the new society which the British bourgeoisie had planted among them, until in Great Britain itself the ruling classes have been superseded by the industrial proletariat, or until the Indians themselves become strong enough that they can cast off the English yoke for all time" (K. Marx, F. Engels, "Works," Vol 9, pp 228-229). In the words of Engels, "A nation that is oppressing other nations cannot be free. The power which it requires to oppress the other nation is in the end always turned against itself" (Op cit, Vol 18, p 509).

At all stages of the revolutionary movement the founders of scientific communism were fighting on two fronts: on the one hand, against bourgeois reformism, nationalism and opportunism, which held up to similar analysis the role and consequences of colonial usurpations and the enslavement of the nations of the East; and on the other hand, against various kinds of sectarians, "who did not notice" that colonial rule in the countries of Asia and Africa inevitably brought forth an ally of the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries--a broad front of national-patriotic and anti-colonialist forces.

Marx and Engels not only disclosed the systematic nature of the revolutionary transition to socialism in the industrially-developed countries; they also devoted a great deal of attention to questions of the transition of backward countries to socialism, bypassing capitalism. Proceeding from the objective tendency in the development of capitalism toward deepening and expanding interaction and interdependence among separate countries, Marx and Engels came to the conclusion that after the proletariat is victorious in a number of major states, the backward countries will be able to significantly speed up their development on the path of socio-economic progress, relying on their assistance and example (Op cit., Vol 4, p 334; Vol 19, p 305).

Questions of interaction and mutual influence in the struggle of the working class and the anticolonial movement in the contemporary epoch were continually at the center of Lenin's attention. The founder of the CPSU and the Soviet state was at the same time proceeding from the heterogeneous nature of the separate currents of the world revolutionary process, and took note of "the necessity for a decisive struggle with the false colors of the bourgeois-democratic liberation currents in the backward countries in the light of communism..." (Complete Collection of Works, Vol 41, p 167). At the very same time, speaking of the prospects for the victory of a world socialist revolution, Lenin frequently stressed the idea of unity and interaction of the basic contingents of the world anti-imperialist struggle. "Social revolution," he wrote, "cannot take place in any other way than in an epoch which combines a civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries and a GREAT NUMBER of democratic and revolutionary movements, including national-liberation movements in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations" (Vol 30, p 112). Lenin was a firm believer in the revolutionary and creative possibilities of the colonial nations. "The working masses and the peasants of the colonial countries, in spite of the fact that they are presently still backward, will play," in his words, "a very great revolutionary role in the subsequent phases of the world revolution" (Vol 44, p 38).

Life itself convincingly affirms Lenin's prophecy that, starting with a struggle for national freedom and democracy, the nations of the colonial and the dependent nations will come to do battle with the very basis of the capitalist system. This has most vividly come to fruition, on the ruins of the colonial empires, in a large group of states with a socialist orientation, countries which have chosen the path of socialist development.

Even before the victory of the Great October Revolution Lenin expressed his idea that the world proletariat, being the most persistent opponent of national and social oppression, must staunchly stand up for the cooperation of all antimperialist forces. "United with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all oppressed nations against any and all imperialists--such," he declared, "is the foreign policy of the proletariat" (Vol 32, p 337).

The practical experience of the USSR's relations with the young states totally affirms the truth of Lenin's thoughts on the fact that the communists "establish completely different international relations, which provide an opportunity for all oppressed nations to free themselves from the imperialist yoke" (Vol 42, p 107). In contemporary conditions, the objective community of interests in the struggle for peace and national security, for the democratization of international relations, and for opposing the imperialist policy of diktat and exploitation, provides a firm basis for developing friendly relations between the USSR and the countries which are being liberated. These relations are built on the principles of independence and equal rights, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual respect and mutually-advantageous cooperation, and on anti-imperialism and anti-colonial solidarity. "In the nations which have been liberated from colonialism," CPSU Central General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev stressed, "we see friends and equal partners in the struggle for the cause of peace and progress, and we are in total solidarity with their aspirations to assert their sovereignty and to defend their freedom and independence. Within the framework of equality and cooperation and to the extent of our own capabilities, we will help them to establish their primary national economy. In a word, we are doing and we shall do everything in order to expand and deepen friendly cooperation with the countries being liberated, on the basis of equal rights."

Exaggerating the theme of the "contradictions" of the communist approach to the national liberation movement, the imperialist bourgeoisie and its allies are striving thereby to neutralize the influence on these movements of the ideals of scientific communism, and to suppress the activities of progressive parties and socio-political organizations; to undermine the prestige of world socialism; to justify the preservation of the exploitative system of neocolonialism; and to disrupt the united front in the peoples' struggle for relaxation of international tensions. It goes without saying that no such falsified, vain attempts of "sovietologists" are capable of besmirching the fundamental principles of the relationships between world socialism and the national-liberation movement, nor can they belittle their role in modern world development.

Anticommunist "experts" from Western university centers (L. Gann, P. Diugnan, R. Bissel, D. Albright, P. Wayles and others) would like to spread disbelief in socialism among the masses--disbelief in socialist countries, and above all in the Soviet Union. At the very same time they are actively working out the theoretical bases of the neocolonialist foreign policy of the imperialist powers, which is becoming more and more cruel and is an integral part of a "crusade" against communism, declared by the American administration and its allies.

The ideological attack of imperialism, which is intended to undermine the unity of the basic currents of world revolutionary process, and the nature of the social forces which are subjected to propagandistic manipulation, are considered carefully. Whereas, let us say, imperialist propaganda in the countries being liberated continuously confronts the national-bourgeois elements with the idea of Moscow's "general expansion" and the threat of the danger of "exporting revolution;" on the other hand, it also puts into the minds of the revolutionary-democratic forces the idea that the USSR purportedly is "betraying" them in favor of its own "vital" interests.

Distorting the theory and practice of the socialist orientation of the liberated countries and the role of foreign and domestic factors in their development occupies a special position in the falsifying efforts of the bourgeois ideologues and propagandists.

As is well known, social revolutions in many Asian and African countries have become anticapitalistic in nature. A large group of states has risen up in the zone of the national liberation struggle which has chosen the path of socialist orientation (Algeria, Angola, Afghanistan, the Congo, the PDRY, Ethiopia, and others). They are waging a decisive struggle against the policy of neocolonialism, and are carrying out profound socio-economic changes directed at creating the prerequisites for the future transition to building socialism; and, they are strengthening their militant solidarity with other revolutionary forces, and principally with the Soviet Union.

The victories of the national-democratic revolutions in Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and a number of other countries have given rise to an unbridled anticommunist campaign, and a whole stream of slanderous accusations against the USSR, to the effect that in its relations with the developing countries it is trying to "export a form of a closed society," and is "foisting upon" the political leaders of the liberated countries their own "totalitarian" model of social organization.

It is easy to see that these kinds of insinuations are intended for an audience which does not have the slightest conception of the principles of Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of genuine socialism. Anybody who will take the trouble to familiarize himself with at least the rudiments of the scientific world-view of the communists would clearly understand that, in accordance with Marxist-Leninist teachings, revolutions are not made to order or by agreement. The idea of exporting revolution has always been and still is alien and unacceptable to communists. Any revolution is the law-governed result of the internal development of one country or another.

A revolutionary movement is fed by the true reality of life itself, by the unbearable living conditions in which the people are placed by the policy of oppression and exploitation which imperialism conducts. Under the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, it is becoming more and more obvious to millions of people in the liberated countries, that the capitalist way has no future, the more so in its "secondary", dependent, and therefore also especially crude, monstrous forms.

Certain bourgeois authors are propagandizing the conception of "catch-up development." In essence this boils down to the idea that the developing countries can allegedly repeat the path of development of Western capitalism in a short period of time and can soon merge with it as an inseparable part. However even in theory the given conception contains significant flaws, inasmuch as it looks upon the imperialist powers and the developing countries as equal partners in the capitalist economic system. At the same time there is practically not a single example in which development in the "catch-up direction" has not been accompanied with the most severe social and political crises. The very model of dependent development places the developing countries in a quandary of unresolvable contradictions, which give rise to severe crisis situations.

Without a doubt, in certain "third world" countries which are taking the capitalist path, a certain amount of economic growth can be observed. But the concepts of "growth" and "development" are hardly the same. For example, according to the magazine "Gen Afrique", the industrial capital of the Ivory Coast (one of the most "fortunate" African countries) is 40 percent foreign. In 1980, only 46.3 percent of the able-bodied population had work here, and today the figure is even lower. In the African countries which are taking the capitalist way of development, the local bourgeoisie and bureaucratic elite group, which amounts to no more than 5 percent of the populace, gets 60 percent of all income, including that from taking part in neocolonialist activity.

The monstrous nature of dependent capitalism in the young states gives birth to striking social contrasts; it deprives millions of people of the means of existence, and condemns them to torment, hunger and extinction. This is the ineradicable source of the unstable situation in the liberated countries which are part of the capitalist system. And therein lie the roots which nourish the constantly-increasing anti-imperialist, revolutionary potential of the nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America--bearing witness to which are the eruptions of social protest which have taken place in the 1980's in Bangladesh, Tunisia, Pakistan, Zaire, Nigeria, Sudan and a number of other countries.

The rise of the revolutionary struggle in the peripheral regions of the capitalist world and the ever-increasing association of Marxism with the national-liberation movement, are reflections of the objective law-governed nature of the revolutionary transformation of society in the modern epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. Capitalism, along with the colonial enslavement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America,

inevitably has been preparing the conditions for its own revolutionary negation; for, as Lenin wrote: "The overwhelming majority of the earth's populace will in the end be taught and trained for the struggle by capitalism itself" (Vol 45, p 404).

In recent years certain bourgeois-liberal authors have increasingly begun to spread the thesis that the liberated countries have allegedly become a "zone of confrontation between the USSR and the USA." But that is gross slander. States have joined in the confrontation with the contemporary national-liberation movement. And it is in this very place that the causes for the many hotbeds of tension in the world are found, and not in the notorious "superpower rivalry."

The entire postwar policy of imperialism and most of all the American policy with respect to the developing countries, was directed toward resisting the progressive socio-economic changes in them, against strengthening their national sovereignty, and against their gaining economic independence. One should therefore not be surprised that the social storms in the Afro-Asian states, such as the popular revolutions in Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia and a great number of other countries, were declared by the imperialists to be the result of "Soviet expansion." Incidentally, they were of an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist nature from the very beginning, and became even more so in their struggle against the crude oppression and aggression on the part of the forces of international reaction and its hirelings. Moreover, it was precisely the refusal of the aggressive forces of capitalism to acknowledge the fact that all states have the right to sovereignty and independence and the right to freely determine their own path of development, and its attempts to force its own will on them, to refashion and remake the modern world according to their own designs, come hell or high water--it is precisely this that even today is the principal source of danger for the nations, which threatens the entire world.

But as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has never given grounds either for accusation of any kind of "interference" in the affairs of the liberated countries, or for the least amount of doubt in the principled nature and the consistency of its policy in its relations with these countries. At the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum it was pointed out that: "Solidarity with the forces of progress and democracy, with those countries and nations which are defending their freedom in the face of the reactionary onslaught on their freedom and independence, is for us the principal question. Here our policy remains just as clear as it always was... The CPSU and the Soviet state continuously support the rights of all nations to determine by themselves, by their own choice, their own socio-economic present, and to build a future without any kind of interference from without."

Naturally, the young states, and above all those which have made the socialist choice, have a lively interest in the Soviet experience of building a nation state, and in the transition by a number of the peoples of our country to socialism--bypassing the capitalist stage of development. "The many years of experience acquired by the Soviet people in building socialism in all spheres of life will be instructive for us," wrote the Tanzanian newspaper "Uhuru."

Based on the falsified works of bourgeois political scientists, imperialist propaganda falls short of the expectations placed on it. It is neither capable of smearing the effective role of the Soviet Union in the historic process of the national and social liberation of the nations, nor of veiling the aggressive, exploitative essence of imperialist policy. K. Kaunda, president of Zambia, characterizing the attitude of the "front-line" states in Southern Africa toward the conceptions of the American Administration, remarked: "You speak to us about 'the free world,' about 'democracy', and about the 'dangers of totalitarianism and communism,' when at the same time the tragedy which we are enduring on our borders is caused by South Africa alone, whose regime could not survive without your active support and whose interests you defend..."

The Marxist-Leninist conception of international relations proceeds from the classic approach to the phenomena of social life, from the principles of proletarian internationalism and national self-determination, from support of the nations struggling for independence and social progress, and from the commonality of the root interests of the working people for eliminating the exploiter class and building socialism and communism.

Lenin stressed, that "The very deepest roots of both the domestic and the foreign policy of our state are determined by the economic interests, and the economic principles of the ruling classes of our state. These principles must not be forgotten for a single moment; they must not become lost in the thickets and the labyrinth of diplomatic schemes--in a labyrinth which is sometimes even created artificially, in which the people, classes, parties and groups become lost, or which forces them to fish in troubled waters" (Vol. 36 pp 327-328).

There are no forces in the Soviet Union that are interested in establishing and strengthening a system of inequitable economic and trade relations, or in seizing foreign territory. And consequently, any kind of "expansionist" aspirations are alien to Soviet foreign policy. Stubbornly harping on the imaginary "Soviet threat," bourgeois propaganda is just simply trying to divert the attention of world society from the entirely real and widespread expansionistic actions of imperialism in the liberated countries.

The Soviet policy of peace guarantees in the most direct manner favorable external conditions for strengthening the independence of the liberated countries, and advancement along the path of social progress. The Soviet people, just as the peoples of the other socialist countries, are in solidarity with the liberated countries in their struggle for the democratic reconstruction of the inequitable economic system which condemns the young states to poverty and plundering by the international monopolies. The USSR and the countries of socialism are intimately familiar with the platform of the nonaligned movement, which stands for a comprehensive solution to global problems, for ensuring humane living conditions for the masses of people in their billions in the poorly-developed regions of the capitalist world. Today these democratic movements are uniting in the closest possible manner with the antiwar movement, which embraces our entire planet. Curbing the

arms race unleashed by imperialism and making use of the resources released thereby for lifting up the economies of the countries which are lagging in their development--this is the most humane initiative of world socialism, meeting the daily needs of the progressive course of human civilization as a whole.

Eliminating the hotbeds of tension, and peacefully resolving a number of conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America could be furthered by a step wherein each permanent member of the UN Security Council accepts the obligation to strictly observe the principles of non-interference, renunciation of the use of force or threat of force, and non-involvement in military blocs, in their dealings with the countries of these continents. The Soviet Union is ready to take upon itself such an obligation. This is wholly in keeping with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

Questions of an economic and scientific-technical nature have a prominent place in the relations of world socialism with the liberated countries.

Economic ties between the USSR and India, for example, have brought about solution of important problems in her socio-economic progress--crucial for each historical period--be it establishing the basis for heavy industry, or setting up a fuel-energy complex. Suffice it to say that with the economic and technical assistance of the Soviet Union, more than 70 major industrial projects were built in India. Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi stresses: "We are profoundly grateful for the significant and principled support which the Soviet Union is rendering to our economic development. We are striving to rapidly expand this cooperation."

The following example also testifies to the genuine fruits of Soviet aid to developing countries. The Aswan water engineering system built with Soviet aid in Egypt has become a genuine support of the national economy. "The Aswan hydraulic power engineering complex, built with the technical assistance of the USSR, has been operating at full capacity without any problems at all for 17 years," declared ARE (Arab Republic of Egypt) Minister of Electricity and Energy, Mahir Abaza. "Four years in a row the dam has saved Egypt from inevitable famine. If it had not been for the water reserves, the country would have suffered a catastrophe."

Summing up the nature of the assistance of world socialism to the liberated countries, General Secretary of the Ethiopian Workers' Party Mengistu Haile-Mariam stated: "The economic assistance rendered to Ethiopia by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries over the last decade has permitted her to achieve greater progress than over the forty years which preceded the national-democratic revolution."

The multifaceted and mutually-advantageous cooperation of the countries of the socialist commonwealth with the young states is coordinated within the framework of CEMA. In the early 1980's, the CEMA member nations were rendering economic and technical assistance to 97 developing countries, including 30 countries in Asia, 45 in Africa, and 22 in Latin America. At the same

time, more than two-thirds of the volume of economic and technical assistance rendered to the developing countries by the CEPA members goes for establishing industrial, agricultural and power engineering projects. As of 1984, about 5,000 industrial and other projects were built, were under construction, or were to be built, with the economic and technical participation of the socialist states. About 3,300 projects have already been put into operation, and have been completely turned over to the developing countries as their property.

While falsifying the social and progressive role of world socialism in the international community, bourgeois ideologues are incapable of developing a positive strategy for solving the vital problems of the liberated countries. Such a strategy is coming from the communists, and from all true supporters of social progress in the young states.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Politicheskoye samoobrazovaniye". 1985

9006

CSO: 1807/030

DISCUSSION OF 'SOLUTIONS' TO DEBT PROBLEM

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 41, Oct 85 pp 20-24

[Article by Mikhail Burlakov]

[Text]

The debt crisis gripping the developing countries is one of the most pressing problems of the world economy and the most vulnerable link in the monetary system of capitalism. It has sharply increased the scale of neocolonialist exploitation of the countries of the Third World, created a new lever of imperialist pressure on them, and put the whole international capitalist credit system seriously out of kilter.

The problem has acquired global proportions and impinges on the interests of all countries without exception. It is not only a matter of the astronomical dimensions of foreign indebtedness (the total is estimated to run to the neighbourhood of one trillion dollars with annual payments on principal and interest exceeding \$120 billion), but of its having become a brake on the development of international economic exchange. Because of the interdependence of the countries in the orbit of the capitalist world economic system, the debt crisis impedes foreign trade and has a negative effect on the business situation in the industrial countries of the West. The soaring of the external debts of many countries of the Third World has to all intents and purposes made it impossible for them to give effect to long-term socio-economic programmes.

The problem of the foreign indebtedness of the developing countries cannot but affect the interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries inasmuch as they are active participants in worldwide economic exchange, the monetary included. For adverse situations on the international money markets impede the expansion of our trade, economic and credit relations with the developing and developed capitalist countries.

It is becoming increasingly clear that a just solution of this pressing global problem requires collective effort on the part of the entire world community. What is needed first of all is broad and constructive examination of this problem at a representative international forum with the participation of all the countries concerned.

The use of credits and loans to promote the development of the national economy and to stimulate foreign trade is a common practice. Most Western industrial countries have substantial foreign debts. This year even the United States, which until recently was the biggest international creditor, has become a net debtor to other countries. For many

Third World countries, however, foreign credits, instead of being a stimulus to economic development, have become the main brake on their economies and principal cause of the impoverishment of their peoples. Credits extended to the Third World have in recent years become an instrument of neocolonialist plunder.

Neocolonialist Roots

The International Monetary Fund and the big Western creditor banks lay the entire blame for the situation that has emerged on the developing countries which, they say, have borrowed too much, made insufficiently effective use of loans and ceased to control the growth of indebtedness. This supposedly is the cause of the present foreign debt crisis.

True enough, many developing countries lack the experience the Western industrial countries have in international currency and credit operations. However, the roots of the debt crisis lie in the unequal economic relations between these two groups of countries, the dependent status of the developing countries in the capitalist world economy and its monetary and financial system.

Credit extended in the guise of "development aid" has in recent years become one of the basic forms of the neocolonialist plunder of the Third World. The monetary and credit policy of the U.S. and the expansion of the banking monopolies have created a machinery for siphoning out financial and material resources and this makes it possible to shift the burden of the West's economic difficulties onto the shoulders of Third World countries. An integral part of this neocolonialist plunder are protectionist practices in relation to the developing countries and their involvement in the ruinous arms buildup. Thus, the responsibility for the debt crisis regarding the social and economic development of the Third World rests with the imperialist powers, primarily the United States.

The deliberate jacking up of the lending rate by Washington has had a particularly damaging effect in recent years on the financial position of the developing countries. It has resulted in a wholesale outflow of capital from other countries to the U.S. and the attendant rise in the exchange rate of the dollar. The high interest rates have led to the foreign indebtedness of the Third World increasing by 10-12 per cent annually. Deferment of payments, too, only makes the credits costlier still and nets the U.S. bankers higher profits. As a result of such a credit policy in-

terest payments increase more rapidly than the sum total of the basic debt. Between 1980 and 1985, when total indebtedness increased by 80 per cent, interest payments went up 2.3 times over (from \$30.5 billion to \$69 billion).

The IMF and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development have latterly begun to speak of the debt problem having become less acute since the Western creditors have granted developing countries deferments on repayment of their debts. Actually, however, deferment of debts at high interest rates does not solve the problem, but merely puts off its solution. Meanwhile the debts continue to grow: in 1984 they increased by 6 per cent and a further growth of 8.5 per cent is expected this year.

According to IBRD data, last year the Third World paid the developed capitalist countries more than they received from it. Payments by the developing countries on principal and interest ran to \$126.6 billion, while they received from the West only \$85 billion in new credits, financial aid, and investments.

The economic recovery that set in last year in a number of Third World countries increased their average annual economic development rate by roughly 3 per cent. Nevertheless their foreign indebtedness is not declining. Experts estimate that it will increase from \$895 billion to \$1 trillion. Thus, even in a relatively favourable economic situation the growth rate of debts exceeds that of the economy of the debtor countries more than three times over.

Washington's credit policy not only robs the debtor countries through high interest, it stimulates the outflow of capital needed by their national economies, thereby undermining the fragile economic recovery. In 1980-83 the net inflow of capital into Latin America from Western countries dropped from \$32.2 billion to \$3.2 billion, and last year the net outflow of capital amounted to \$10 billion.

On the other hand, the outflow of capital from the developing countries into the coffers of the transnational corporations in the United States has been increasing. In 1975-84 the transnationals pumped out of the Third

World countries more than \$100 billion in profits on private investments, while the inflow of new investments was less than \$50 billion. Paradoxically enough, Latin American countries up to their ears in debt have in recent years become net exporters of capital, which has further aggravated the debt crisis.

Export of Inflation and Tension

Inasmuch as the lion's share (78.3 per cent) of the developing countries' indebtedness is in U.S. dollars the increase in the exchange rate of the dollar and the corresponding decline in that of the national currencies in relation to the dollar means that a steadily growing part of their exports goes to earn dollars to pay their debts. A high exchange rate of the dollar has the effect of raising the prices of the manufactures Third World countries import from the West and lowering those paid for their exports, mostly raw materials. Thus, the U.S. monetary and credit policy accelerates the rate of inflation, raises the cost of living and makes for the rapid impoverishment of broad sections of the population of the developing countries.

According to IMF data, the inflation rate in 112 developing countries now runs at nearly 60 per cent annually and in many countries is expressed in three-digit figures. For instance, at the beginning of this year prices increased at an annual rate of 1,100 per cent in Argentina, 228 in Brazil, 130 in Peru, 65 in Mexico, nearly 30 in Chile and Ecuador, and by as much as 8,000 per cent in Bolivia.

The financial situation in Third World countries, especially in those with pro-Western regimes, is worsened also by the arms buildup imposed upon them by imperialism. Invoking a mythical "external threat" and artificially creating regional seats of tension, the NATO countries, in their search for bigger markets for their arms concerns, are inducing developing countries to buy costly armaments. As a result, the share of the Third World in the world's total military spending has increased from 4 to 16 per cent since the early sixties, and today it spends more

than \$100 billion on war preparations annually. The West's policy of whipping up international tension has led to a situation when the military spending of the developing countries is roughly equal to their payments on their foreign debts and interest on them.

War preparations swallow up a larger share of the state budgets in many Third World countries than even in NATO countries. In Chile, for example, 32 per cent of budget expenditure goes for military purposes, in Paraguay 24 per cent, in Argentina 23.1 per cent, and in Egypt 15 per cent. In the poorest regions of the planet, where 95 per cent of the population is illiterate and where only one out of three has access to medical care, \$266 million are spent every day for military purposes! The \$100 billion the Third World spends for these purposes could pay, experts estimate, for 300 steam power stations of 120,000 kilowatt capacity each, 300 oil refineries, 1,000 chemical fertilizer works, 1,600 sugar refineries, 10,000 hospitals or 20 million flats. Such is the enormous economic and social price the developing world has to pay today for international tension.

Intolerable Situation

For many years now the economy of the Third World has been bled white by the pumping out to the Western countries of capital badly needed for economic development, the foreign exchange losses resulting from unfair trade practices, the depreciation of national currencies, the rising cost of living, and the arms buildup imposed by imperialism. In the eighties these economic disasters have been compounded by the foreign debt crisis, although actually it is not the developing countries that are in debt to the West, but the latter that owes the Third World more than it can ever pay.

In 1975-85 the developing countries paid Western creditors some \$900 billion in principal and interest—a sum five times their foreign indebtedness in 1975 (\$180 billion). Interest payments alone in the past five years have run to \$235 billion, or more than the total debt of the Third World in 1975.

However, the debt that has already been repaid many times over continues to grow much faster than the debtor countries' ability to pay. Thus, from 1981 to 1983 the gross domestic product of the developing countries increased by only 0.5 per cent whereas their foreign debt grew by 20 per cent (from \$706 billion to \$43 billion) or 40 times faster.

In the worst position were the Latin American countries which are in the epicentre of the debt crisis. As a result of a cyclic recession in the world capitalist economy and their dependence on the U.S., the aggregate gross domestic product of the Latin American countries dropped in this period by 2.0 per cent (in some countries the decline was even greater: 5.0 per cent in Brazil, 9 in Argentina, 9.9 in Chile, 13.9 in Uruguay and 15.7 in Bolivia). At the same time Latin America's external debt increased by 75 per cent.

The solution of the foreign debt problem, therefore, is today crucial to the further development of the region. Latin America must decide first of all what to do about its debt. Fidel Castro said at a recent forum of the Latin American media in Havana. "We must take a decision," he said, "that will erase it from our memory. There are extremely weighty reasons for not paying it. Besides, we must bear in mind that this external debt is unlawful, amoral and unjust."

The foreign debt of many developing countries has almost reached the level of their gross domestic product, and in some (Egypt) even exceeds it. As the table below shows, the indebtedness of these countries and the attendant outflow of money place a far greater strain on their economies than they can cope with. In the countries deepest in debt (for instance, Brazil, Venezuela and Egypt) the per capita debt is greater than the per capita income.

Thus, an intolerable situation has emerged in the economy of a number of developing countries: their national wealth is being exhausted and their internal resources are used not to accelerate economic and social progress but to ensure superprofits to the Western bankers. No wonder then that the debt crisis has become the key issue in international economic relations. The solution of such a global problem as overcoming the economic backwardness of the Third World in effect depends on whether a way out of this crisis is found.

"Stabilization" Washington Style

There are two fundamentally different approaches to the solution of the debt problem. The Washington-controlled International Monetary Fund is forcing upon the debtor countries political and economic terms of repayment that often have no direct relation to their foreign debt commitments. In exchange for deferment of payment on old loans and for new credits they are expected to take drastic socio-economic measures which directly impinge on the living standard of broad sections of the population.

The so-called "stabilization programmes" imposed on Third World countries by the IMF prescribe the reduction of state appropriations for medical care, education and other social needs, wage cuts, devaluation of national currencies, and the ending of state food price subsidies. At the same time, the IMF presses the governments of the debtor countries to give foreign capital freer access to their economies and to dismantle the state sector, which is tantamount to eliminating the very foundations of economic independence. The austerity measures the IMF insists upon essentially disregard the external conditions for the settlement of the debt problem, although the reasons for the emergence and aggravation of the debt crisis lie precisely in the West's economic relations with the Third World.

In pressing on the Third World their prescriptions for the solution of the debt problem, the IMF and the Western bankers cannot ignore the fact that the debtor countries' chances of being able to pay their debts and to sustain the necessary economic development rate are directly dependent on economic growth in the developed capitalist countries. According to IMF estimates, a minimum 3 per cent annual economic growth rate in the West is essential for the solution of the debt problem. However, most forecasters agree that this year it will at best be 2.8 per cent. In the United States, according to preliminary estimates, it will not exceed 2 per cent, and another economic crisis is expected next year. Economic growth rates in Western Europe at the beginning of this year were even lower than in the United States. A new recession in the U.S. will mean a slowdown in the economies of Western Europe and Japan, which will be followed by their involvement in another crisis. In the wake of the developed capitalist countries, the developing countries, too, which have not yet recovered from the effects of the 1980-82 crisis, will soon be drawn into the vortex of the new crisis.

With the indebtedness of the developing countries growing tens of times faster than their average annual growth rate, the situation in the world capitalist economy does not afford even minimal conditions for resolving the debt problem on the terms laid down by the IMF and the Western banks.

To meet its foreign debt commitments a debtor country must constantly increase its exports or reduce its imports. The Washington headquarters of the IMF insists on both. But there are natural limits to such an economic policy—the insufficiently developed export potential of most of the developing countries, for instance. Even countries with a relatively high potential encounter difficulties. For if 70 to 80 per cent of their export earnings goes to repay debts, their export operations (and their foreign trade in general) no longer promote the development of the national economy. Priority expansion of export branches inevitably narrows down the domestic market on which the national economy rests; moreover, it increases

the dependence of the given country on the import of equipment and technology essential for the production of competitive output. But how to pay for these imports if the bulk of export earnings goes to repay the debts and the interest on them?

According to data released by the Secretariat of the Latin American Economic System, in 1982 the debtor countries had to spend a large part of their export earnings on repayment of debts—Brazil 85 per cent (as against 14.2 per cent in 1972), Mexico 73 per cent (22), Argentina 64 (20.5) and Chile 80 (10). By reducing imports of industrial equipment and food, the Latin American countries are undermining their own economy and giving rise to social and political instability, as evidenced by the events in Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia and Peru. It is not by chance that it is these countries that are objecting to the "stabilization programmes" forced upon them by the IMF. It is becoming increasingly clear that the attempts of the debtor countries to solve two problems at once—expansion of export and repayment of debts—are futile. Equally obvious is it that such efforts can only lead to greater dependence of the national economies of the developing countries on the vicissitudes of the economic situation in the United States and other Western countries.

Protectionist Barriers

Reliance on expansion of exports as a way out of the debt morass is unrealistic also because of the present trends in the foreign trade policy of the Western countries, the salient features of which are **protectionism and slashing of the prices of the raw materials exported by developing countries.**

As the negative consequences of its unprecedented foreign trade deficit (this year it is estimated to reach \$150 billion) make themselves increasingly felt, the U.S. is trying to solve the problem at the expense of its trading partners. Besides tightening restrictions at home on imports from the developing countries, it is depressing prices for these goods on the world market. As a result of this policy the world price for sugar, the main export item of many Latin

American countries, has dropped by about four fifths in the past two years (from \$632 to \$130 per ton). Export prices for cocoa and soya beans, copper, tin and silver have also fallen. According to official figures, in 1980-84 the Latin American countries lost more than \$14 billion owing to discriminatory U.S. trade practices.

Washington nevertheless intends further to limit the import of sugar from the Latin American countries and to raise tariff barriers to the import of textile and leather goods, agricultural and other items. As a result of the protectionist measures and the cutting of prices on raw materials exported from Latin American countries to the United States, these prices, according to figures released by the Organization of American States, dropped by 18 per cent in 1982 and from March to August 1984, by another 10 per cent. World prices of many types of raw materials have dropped to the lowest level in 45 years. In the beginning of the sixties an Asian country could buy a lorry for the price of 6 tons of jute, whereas by the early eighties it had to pay the price of 26 tons. If the cost of a tractor in 1950 equalled the price of 2.1 tons of coffee, by the early eighties it cost the Latin Americans 10.3 tons of coffee.

Needed: A Comprehensive Approach

The attempts made over the past three years to resolve the debt crisis by IMF and Washington prescriptions have demonstrated that far from coping with the problem they are giving it dimensions that threaten the entire world economy. The imperialist powers are deliberately dragging out a settlement of the problem in order to perpetuate the credit dependence, and with it the political dependence, of the Third World on the West.

At their international forums within the framework of the non-aligned movement and at special conferences on the debt problem—held last year in Quito, Ecuador, and in Cartagena, Colombia—the developing countries went on record that the problem is not a purely economic one but requires a political solution. The leaders of many Third World countries

hold that the way out of the critical situation should be sought in a comprehensive programme that would take into account both the external and internal factors of their economic development. Some elements of this programme have already been formulated and are supported by the majority of the debtor countries.

Top priority among international measures capable of substantially easing the economic straits of the developing countries belongs to the ending of the arms race unleashed by the West and the channelling of part of the resources thus released to development purposes. This position has been repeatedly set forth by Third World spokesmen at forums of the non-aligned movement and at U.N. General Assembly sessions. Many prominent leaders of the Third World hold that the safeguarding of international security and disarmament should be linked with the promotion of economic and social progress in the developing countries. The countries of the socialist community have on repeated occasions put forward concrete initiatives to this end.

It is common knowledge that the White House is financing the "re-armament of America" largely at the expense of other peoples. It has to be paid for also by the developing countries from where capital attracted by high bank rates flows to the U.S. Thus, the U.S. arms buildup policy is directly associated with its policy of costly international credit and the overrated dollar, which is sapping the world capitalist economy and the economy of the developing debtor countries. The need for a change in the destructive monetary and credit policy of the U.S. and other Western countries is logically associated by the developing countries with the broader issue of the need for the fundamental restructuring of the international monetary system now based on the hegemony of the dollar.

The solution of the debt problem also presupposes the strengthening of the economic and foreign trade positions of the majority of the developing countries, which buy from 30 to 40 per cent of the exports of the industrial states. The newly independent states rightly urge that the West renounce its protectionist policy which artificially checks the growth of their exports and limits their ability to import goods and services from the developed countries. What

is needed is a general liberalization of the terms of international trade that would make for its expansion, hasten the economic development of the Third World, and at the same time help to resolve its debt problem.

The debtor countries are also sharply critical of the very idea of "bilateral" negotiations on debts the Western creditors are insisting upon. Such "bilateral negotiations" are conducted with individual debtor countries by the IMF, which represents the interests of the U.S. and other Western creditor countries. The obvious inequality of the parties to such talks enables the IMF to compel each debtor country separately to accept its "stabilization programme" designed to ensure repayment of debts regardless of the national interests of the given country. In view of this, the developing countries consider it necessary to restructure the international trade and monetary and credit organizations in such a way as to ensure the observance of democratic procedures practised in U.N. agencies. A concrete step in this direction could be made in the course of global talks within the U.N. framework on a wide range of problems of trade, development and monetary and credit relations, the holding of which the Western countries have been sabotaging for more than three years now.

Unity, Equality and Mutual Assistance

In addition to the IMF, the IBRD, the Bank for International Settlements and other financial organizations controlled by the Western creditors, a new one was added in January 1983 when the debt crisis became particularly acute—the Institute of International Finance. The purpose of this latest collective organ of Western countries, set up on the initiative of the leading American banks, is to protect the credit extended by Western bankers and ensure the uninterrupted repayment of principal and interest. Uniting the 35 top private banking houses headed by the U.S. transnational giants Citibank, Bank of America and Chase Manhattan, it studies the state of the economies and the financial position of the debtor countries and orients the Western bankers' credit policy accordingly. The debtor coun-

tries, on the other hand, have no international organization, and many developing countries believe that the time has come to establish a collective body that would protect their financial interests.

The overcoming of the debt crisis on a fair basis depends in large measure on how united the developing countries stand. No small part can be played here by collective reliance on their own forces—the promotion of economic integration, trade without the cash nexus, and self-sufficiency through cooperation among the developing countries. In this connection a number of Third World countries are evincing a keen interest in the collective experience of the CMEA countries, which have registered significant achievements in economic integration and the utilization of their own international monetary and financial institutions—the International Bank for Economic Cooperation and the International Investment Bank. This experience convincingly shows that the stable economic development of countries at different economic, scientific and technological levels (for instance, Kampuchea and the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and Mongolia, the U.S.S.R. and Cuba) is perfectly feasible. It is precisely thanks to such cooperation on the principles of equality and mutual assistance that countries which were insufficiently developed in the past are rapidly building up their productive forces and making full use of their social progress.

The long and bitter experience of the Third World has shown that it cannot overcome its economic lag by relying on the international monetary and credit organizations set up by the West. Consequently, some developing countries are calling for the establishment of an international monetary and credit organization that would help solve development problems, promote economic integration and the expansion of trade and economic ties among the developing countries. Such an organization would concentrate foreign exchange resources, attend to multilateral settlements, foreign trade credits and other banking operations essential for the development of the economies of the Third World countries. Using the existing international monetary and credit system, the U.S. and other Western countries accumulate large

financial resources, primarily "petrodollars" (the OPEC countries' oil earnings), in the banking system of the West. These resources are used not so much to help the needy countries as to exert economic and political pressure on these countries.

The debt problem has assumed such dimensions as to rule out its solution by a simple arrangement between debtor and creditor. It calls primarily for political measures. An important step in this direction, the developing countries believe, would be the convening of an international monetary conference within the framework of the United Nations and with the participation of all the countries concerned—developing, developed capitalist and socialist.

The emergence and aggravation of the debt crisis in recent years has conclusively shown that the problem can be resolved only along the lines of struggle for a new international economic order.

/9274

CSO: 1812/35

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

TABLE OF CONTENTS: AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA NO 9, 1985

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 9, Sep 85 p 1

[Text] TOWARD THE 27TH CPSU CONGRESS

Smirnov, G. Africa. Certain Problems of Economic Decolonization . .	2
Kanunnikov, N. USSR -- Syria. A Strong Basis, Good Prospects . . .	7
The Vital Force of the Ideas of Bandung	9

FORTY YEARS OF THE GREAT VICTORY

Savin, A. The Feat in the East	10
--	----

IN THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Khrekov, V. Vietnam. Won By the Revolution	14
Chugrov, S. The DPRK. From Goal to Goal	18

ALONG THE PATH OF PROGRESSIVE TRANSFORMATIONS

Zhigunov, A., Nikolayevskiy, I. Zimbabwe. A Move Backward is Possible	21
---	----

ROUNDTABLE

Revolution and Reform in the National Development of the Eastern Countries	24
--	----

AGAINST APARTHEID AND RACISM

Bushin, V. Namibia: "Who Are Temporary Here?..."	32
--	----

IDEOLOGY AND POLITICS

Prokofyev, D. The Great Plundering of the Palestinians. Third Article	34
---	----

TRAVELS, MEETINGS, IMPRESSIONS

Yegorin, A. Egypt. The Second Birth of Abu-Simbel	38
Akhmedzyanov, A. Iran. "Marshal MAZ"	42

EVENTS...FIGURES...FACTS...	44
-------------------------------------	----

REVIEWS, INFORMATION

Menteshashvili, Z. The Berbers	48
--	----

BRIEFLY ABOUT COUNTRIES

Rubtsov, B. Papua -- New Guinea	51
---	----

CULTURE, LITERATURE, ART

Novikov, V. West Africa. Traditional Masks	54
Okpi, Kalu (Nigeria). Special Powers. A Short Story. Continuation .	55

RELIGIONS, BELIEFS, CULTS

Yevgenyev, D. Ashura -- The Ten Days of Mourning of the Shiites . .	60
---	----

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS

Maksimov, V. The East: Paths of Social Evolution	62
Andreasyan, R. Mineral Resources in the Service of Industrialization	63
Tkachenko, A. Small Firms in the Indian Economy	63

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya". 1985
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

10272

CSO: 1807/036

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

REVIEW OF JOURNAL AZIA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, NO 9, SEPTEMBER 1985

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 26 Sep 85 pp 1-4

[Text] The issue opens with an article contributed by Doctor G. Smirnov, "Some Problems of the Economic Decolonization of Africa." The article deals with the efforts by newly-free African and Asian states to strengthen their economic independence. Western powers' neocolonialist policy hinders the successful achievement of this aim.

In a thousand ways they are trying to tie these countries to themselves in order to dispose more freely of their natural wealth and to use their territory for their strategic plans.

Anxious to hold up the development of the Afro-Asian countries, the imperialists are imposing on them inequitable agreements in the trade, economic and financial fields. The result is an intensification of the many forms of dependence of the developing nations in the West. Imperialist powers attach to their economic and financial aid various strings of an economic, military and political nature impinging on the national sovereignty of the emergent states and retarding their progress. Thus, the imperialists demand that these countries abandon their plans of overall industrialization or postpone their realization, restrict the activity of the state sector, open the road fully for foreign capital and so on.

The newly-independent countries have not ceased their struggle against neocolonialist policy. This finds reflection, for example, in their demands for a new international economic order.

"Restructuring international economic relations on a democratic foundation, along lines of equality, is natural from the point of view of history," it is stressed in the documents of the 26th Congress of the CPSU. The struggle of the young national states to consolidate their economic independence is reflected in restrictions on the activity of foreign capital, in the strengthening of the state sector of the economy, in the abolition of the one-sided orientation toward the development of trade, economic and other ties with the West and a number of other steps.

In an article entitled "USSR-Syria: A Firm Basis, Favorable Prospects," the journal's own correspondent N. Kanunnikov says that cooperation between the

Soviet Union and Syria bears a many-sided character and that one of the key fields is the economy of this Arab country, in particular, its branches like power and electrification, the oil industry, transport and irrigation.

The process dates back from the 28 October 1957 Agreement on Economic and Technological Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and Syria. It should be noted that the Syrian Arab Republic was the first Arab country to sign a document of this kind.

The agreement provided for cooperation in setting up a Syrian power industry and a power supply system, in indentifying and developing raw material resources, in building railways and irrigation works and in training national personnel.

Soviet-Syrian economic and technological cooperation has proved its viability and mutual advantageousness. The fruitfulness of bilateral relations that marked the seventies put on the agenda the question of their further development and streamlining. A logical result of this process was the signing in 1980 of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the SAR, which not only confirmed the achieved level of relations but also opened up new prospects before them.

The Treaty became an important factor for stabilizing the situation in the region, for reinforcing the international standing of the SAR and a necessary guarantee of its security, which became particularly obvious during the time of Israel's aggression against Lebanon in 1982 and the subsequent attempts by imperialist states and international Zionism to exert military-political pressure on Syria.

In his article "Gained by the Revolution," V. Khrekov writes that 40 years ago the Communist Party chaired by Ho Chi Minh, a revolutionary and internationalist, led the Vietnamese people in the August Revolution. It is inextricably linked to the outstanding feat of the Soviet people in World War II and the Great Victory over German Nazism and Japanese militarism.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the first state of the working people in Southeast Asia, was proclaimed on September 2, 1945. Displaying exemplary courage and staunchness, the Vietnamese people have safeguarded and multiplied the gains of the revolution, and cleared their land of the American and other foreign invaders and their henchmen.

Today the united socialist Vietnam is the bulwark of peace and security of nations in that part of the world. The triumph of the Vietnamese people's righteous cause is largely associated with an all-round help and support of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community.

An official friendly visit last summer to the Soviet Union by a party and government delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam led by General Secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party's Central Committee Le Duan came as an impressive indication of the unbreakable unity of the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples. The talks between the leaders of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Soviet delegation proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship,

cordiality and mutual understanding. It was stated with satisfaction that the sides had a complete unity of views on all the problems they had debated.

The talks revealed a mutual determination of the sides to continue furthering and improving friendly ties and take an active part in the international socialist division of labor.

The journal also runs materials under the general headings "Travels, Encounters, Impressions," "Information in Brief About Countries," "Culture, Literature, Art" and so forth.

CSO: 1812/010-E

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

FUTURE OF SOVIET-SYRIAN RELATIONS SEEN AS FAVORABLE

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 9, Sep 85 pp 7-8

[Article by N.Kanunnikov, the journal's correspondent in the Near Eastern countries: "The USSR -- Syria, a Strong Basis, Favorable Prospects"]

[Text] Collaboration between the Soviet Union and Syria is of a diverse nature and is carried out in various areas, among which one of the most important is the economy of this Arab country, in particular such sectors of it as power and electrification, the petroleum industry, transportation, irrigation and a number of others. The start to the development of this process was made by the Agreement on Economic and Technical Collaboration Between the Soviet Union and Syria of 28 October 1957. It should be pointed out that Syria was the first Arab country which signed such a document. The agreement provides for collaboration on the question of establishing a national power industry and a national power supply system, the discovery and exploitation of raw material resources, railroad construction, the building of irrigation systems and the training of the national cadres of the republic.

Undoubtedly the Euphrates Hydropower Project is the largest project of Soviet-Syrian economic collaboration. In order to more clearly appreciate its place in the Syrian economy, several figures must be given. The GES on the Euphrates provides over 25 percent of the electric power generated in the nation. The dam has formed the Al-Assad Reservoir with a capacity of 12 billion m³ and this in the future will make it possible to double the area of irrigated lands in the nation. As was stated by the Syrian President Hafiz Assad, the Euphrates Project "serves as a symbol of Arab-Soviet friendship and a model of collaboration between the peoples of Syria and the Soviet Union. The economic and social benefits of the Euphrates Dam are numerous and enormous, its significance is great, as it is an effective means on the path of fundamental changes in our society and way of life."

The transmitting of electric power from the Euphrates GES to the central and western regions of the nation, where the basic portion of the population lives and the industrial enterprises are concentrated, is carried out by a power

transmission line totaling around 2,500 km in length and built with Soviet assistance and encompassing the entire territory of the republic. With technical aid from the Soviet Union they have begun reconstructing the Euphrates Hydropower Project. The goal of this is to raise the water level another 4 m and this will substantially increase the capacity of the GES and provide additional power generating.

The republic government took a decision to build a new major hydropower project on the Northern Kebir River which is to the northeast of Latakia. Construction on this project, the second in importance and size after the Euphrates one, started in 1979. Here they will build a dam over 800 m long and 53 m high as well as other hydropower and irrigational works. The dam will make it possible to create a man-made reservoir with a volume of around 200 million m³.

"The erection of the project," said the leader of construction at the hydropower project, Alladin Suleiman, "is being carried out with economic and technical assistance from the Soviet Union and will be completed in 1986. The reservoir will irrigate around 14,000 hectares and this will make it possible for us each year to produce approximately 37,000 tons of citrus fruit, more than 14,000 tons of peanuts, many vegetables and other agricultural produce. In addition, the water supply for Latakia and other population points will be improved. Soviet specialists are not only helping us build but are also passing on their rich experience and this, undoubtedly, will help to further strengthen friendship and collaboration between the peoples of our countries."

With Soviet assistance Syria will also build thermal power plants. Thus, in Wadian ar-Rabi, a suburb of the Syrian capital, using Soviet plans in the near future they will begin building a TES of 400,000 kilowatts and in the future 800,000 kilowatts. This is equal to the power of the present Euphrates GES.

The Soviet Union, in helping Syria in developing its hydropower resources, is also participating in the establishing of irrigation systems. Thus, with the participation of Soviet specialists plans are being drawn up for using the waters of the Al-Assad Reservoir in the area of the Euphrates GES and carrying out irrigation work on an area of 85,000 hectares. Some 21,000 of these, in the Meskene area, are already being irrigated. Here they have established a model state farm on an area of 4,000 hectares. For it the Soviet government has provided farm machinery and equipment. Soviet cotton growers, beet raisers and other specialists are helping develop these lands. In 1979, one of the first major irrigation projects was put into operation, a pumping station with a productivity of 36 m³ a second and designed to deliver water to irrigated areas from the Al-Assad Reservoir. Using plans and with assistance of Soviet organizations, construction is underway on the largest head pumping station in the Near East and a large canal some 80 km long. After the completion of these projects it will be possible to irrigate over 200,000 decarees of desert land.

"The carrying out of this project," said the chief engineer of construction on the project, Haled-at-Talui, "is of enormous significance for the national economy both on the level of solving the food problem and from the social viewpoint as over 200,000 peasants will farm on the irrigated fields."

According to the estimates of specialists, the development of the lands in the Meskene area will provide an opportunity to increase annual grain production here by 4.5-fold, meat by 11-fold and in addition they will produce 18,500 tons of cotton, more than 55,000 tons of vegetables and other farm products. The creation of such a major agricultural area in the future presupposes the construction of enterprises to process the agricultural products and this, in turn, will increase the level of the population's employment.

A weak link in the Syrian infrastructure has always been the insufficiently developed railroad network. The existing railroads built at the beginning of the century were not interconnected, they are obsolete in technical terms and cannot handle the transport volume. A solution to this problem was aided by the agreements with the Soviet Union signed in 1974 and 1977 and in accord with them there were plans to lay new railroads and reconstruct the old ones with delivery from the USSR of diesel locomotives and other rolling stock. Today, with assistance from the Soviet organizations, Syria has built over 1,400 km of track, that is, virtually the entire operating rail network. The completion in 1984 of the 180-km Homs-Halab Rail Line completed the transport linkage of Damascus with all the nation's major cities. The unified rail network which has been created with Soviet technical aid meets all modern requirements. It has linked the northeastern oil regions with the Mediterranean Coast and dependably transports more than one-half of all the freight and around 90 percent of the passenger traffic.

An important role in the Syrian economy must be played by the reconstruction and expansion of the Latakia Port, the "seagates" of the republic. The importance of this port in the development of commercial and foreign trade ties is difficult to overestimate for Syria. Considering the difficult situation in the region, this importance has increased sharply.

"The port is a major transport center of Syria which is of enormous significance for the national economy," said its General Director Ramadan at-Tyia. "Considering this, the republic government adopted a decision to enlarge the port and in 1977, according to Soviet plans and with Soviet technical aid, basic construction work was started. Along with the major economic effect of bringing the port's cargo turnover up to 7 million tons a year, that is, increasing this by almost 5-fold, this will provide us with the possibility using the help of Soviet specialists to train our own national cadres for building similar installations in the future. In this sense the work of enlarging the Port of Latakia, where our Soviet colleagues have employed a whole series of unique engineering ideas, is fine professional schooling for the Syrian specialists and the completion of its construction will make a major contribution to developing the existing friendly relations between our peoples."

The list of projects in Soviet-Syrian economic collaboration would be incomplete if mention was not made of the enterprises in the petroleum-producing industry and established with Soviet aid. In a short period of time (since 1968) this has become a highly profitable sector of the economy. As a result of geological prospecting, oil deposits were discovered in the regions of Suwaydia, Rumailan, Karachuk and Hurbet and geological reserves of this valuable raw material were established. The first oil was produced in 1968

ai

and Syria, thus, became the first Arab country which began producing oil without the involvement of the Western petroleum monopolies. With the opening up of the deposits in the northeast of the nation, petroleum output now is 8.4 million tons.

Soviet assistance in the prospecting and production of oil has made it possible for Syria within the state sector to create an oil-producing sector that plays one of the key roles in the nation's economy. At present, Syria not only completely covers its own internal requirements for oil but also exports it to other nations, including to the Soviet Union. Income from its sale is an important source of foreign exchange earnings.

Syria inherited from the French colonialists economic backwardness, poverty and illiteracy. The tasks of developing an independent national economy and increasing the material and cultural level of the people dictated the need to quickly resolve the problem of training national cadres. And here the Soviet Union provides great aid to Syria. The forms of this aid are diverse. One of them, as was already mentioned, is the training of Syrians in professional skills in the course of building industrial projects. Over the years of collaboration, more than 35,000 skilled workers, engineers and technicians have been trained. Just during the construction of the Euphrates hydropower project more than 15,000 men, a majority of whom were peasants, received worker specialties. This method of instruction is recognized by the Syrians as corresponding most to their conditions, as additional material outlays are not required from them.

The vocational and technical training centers established with Soviet aid play an important role in the training of national cadres. Successfully functioning is a center for the training of skilled workers in 25 specialties for the Euphrates Hydropower Project and a motor vehicle training center in Damascus. In 1985, there are plans to open centers for the training of skilled railroad workers in Halab, oil workers in Rumailan as well as polytechnical training centers in Homs and Dayr as Zawr. All of these are being equipped with modern equipment and training materials from the USSR.

Soviet-Syrian economic and technical collaboration has shown its viability and benefits for both countries. The fruitful nature of the bilateral relations established in the 1970's raised the question of their further deepening and improvement. The logical result of this process was the signing in 1980 of a Treaty of Friendship and Collaboration Between the USSR and Syria and this not only strengthened the achieved level of relations but also opened up new prospects for them. The treaty has become an important factor in stabilizing the situation in the region and in strengthening the international positions of Syria as well as a necessary guarantee for security. This was particularly apparent during the period of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon in 1982 and the subsequent attempts by the imperialist states and international Zionism to put military and political pressure on Syria.

In the course of talks held in Moscow in June of the current year between the Syrian President Hafiz Assad and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev, both sides expressed satisfaction with the successful development of the diversified relations between the USSR and Syria.

on the firm basis of the Treaty of Friendship and Collaboration. H. Assad highly praised the extensive help of the Soviet Union in developing the Syrian economy.

Over all these years the relations between the two friendly states have been enriched with a new content, they have grown stronger and wider. Syria was the first among the Arab countries to achieve independence, relying on the struggle of its people and the support from the Soviet Union.

Since then much has changed in the contemporary world. But Soviet-Syrian friendship remains unchangeably firm.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya". 1985
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

10272

CSO: 1807/036

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

ROUNDTABLE ON REVOLUTION, REFORM IN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 9, Sep 85 pp 24-31

[Roundtable Report prepared by Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Birchanskaya on "Revolution and Reform in the National Development of the Eastern Countries"]

[Text] Participating in the roundtable discussion were Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences G. F. Kim (Institute for Eastern Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences), Doctor of Historical Sciences S. L. Agayev (Institute for the International Workers Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences), Doctor of Historical Sciences G. I. Mirskiy (Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences), Candidate of Historical Sciences V. I. Maksimenko (Institute of Eastern Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences), Doctor of Historical Sciences N. A. Simoniya (Institute of Eastern Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences) and Doctor of Historical Sciences V. G. Khoros (Institute of Eastern Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences).

G. Kim: The subject which we have selected for the roundtable is among the permanently pertinent. Since the "awakening of Asia" which marked a new age of transforming social relations in the East, complex intertwinings of revolution and reform have been inseparable factors of national development. Within this era there have been various ascents of general national movements and an exacerbation of antagonistic class relations, sharp jumps forward and retreats, relatively peaceful periods and outbursts of political violence.

In developing the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution under present-day conditions, it is important not only to see the diverse forms of the revolutionary process but also to endeavor to look at tomorrow. As for reform, we would like to emphasize the difference between this factor of national development and the reformism of the ruling classes arising out of a fear of the spontaneous initiative of the masses and a mistrust of the creative forces of their own people. I remember in this context the words of

V. I. Lenin who emphasized that reforms are to the liking of those who "emerged from the confines of reformism." (1)

I feel that we are also dealing with the problems of the predominance of social tasks in the social movement of the Eastern countries. This does not mean that the national tasks here have been "eliminated" as at present they are being carried out in close relationship to the search for the ways of social liberation and considering the demands of the broad working masses. I would also like the roundtable participants to take up the interpretation of such questions as the national liberation revolution, revolutions "from above" and "from below," the relationship of revolution and reform in the general sociological sense and in terms of the developing countries, as well as the problem of the possible divergence of objective and subjective factors in the area of the national liberation revolution.

Thus, since the discussion involves scientists from different institutes, I will turn the floor over to our guests. If you please, Georgiy Ilich [Mirskiy].

G. Mirskiy: I would like to start with the concept of the "national liberation revolution."

The term "revolution" in terms of the developing countries can be employed in two senses: in the broad, global one (the "age of national liberation revolutions") and in a narrow one when it is a question of social revolutions in individual countries which have already freed themselves from colonial domination.

Let us first take up revolution in the first meaning. The term "national liberation revolution" which designated the culmination of the national liberation movement is apt, in our view, for describing those outbursts and those political moments of change which have led to the downfall of the colonial system. Here it makes no difference what accompanied the collapse of the former order, that is, a violent action (for example, in the nations of Indochina, Algeria, the African Colonies of Portugal and so forth), the departure of the colonialists as a result of an extended mass struggle (in India, Egypt, Tunisia, Syria, Kenya, the Congo and so forth) or the "voluntary" giving up of direct rule by the colonial power to avoid even worse (in many Tropical African countries in 1960).

Can it be said that precisely such a revolution is continuing now? Can one term as a revolution that protracted process extended over the decades which has brought the developing countries ultimately to economic liberation? Is this process a new, second stage in the struggle of the national liberation revolution? Up to this point we have answered these questions affirmatively. It seems to me that at present it is no longer valid to speak about the national liberation movement (and revolution) as something continuing unchanged.

(1) V. I. Lenin, PSS [Complete Collected Works], Vol 22, p 315.

G. Kim: Do you mean that the national liberation revolution in the East has exhausted its general democratic tasks?

G. Mirskiy: Of course not. The liberation antiimperialist and anticolonial movement of the peoples of the Afro-Asian countries is continuing and will undoubtedly develop. Its goal is the struggle for economic self-dependence and equality. The term "economic self-dependence" better reflects the essence of things than does "economic independence." At present, it is a question of the desire of the young states in relying on a developed national economic base to resist the actions of the imperialist monopolies and a desire of these states for equality in the area of international economic relations. However, the struggle for economic independence is not a revolution. Certainly the national liberation revolution is a particular variety of social revolution the main feature of which, according to Lenin's thesis, is "the transition of state power from the hands of one class to the hands of another."⁽²⁾ Having carried out the task of political liberation, the national liberation revolution in the developing countries has achieved its prime goal, that is, power has shifted from the imperialist bourgeoisie ruling in the colonies to the hands of new, different classes or groups.

V. Maksimenko: I would like to clarify your statement, Georgiy Ilich. On the point of the specific nature of the national liberation (anticolonial) revolutions that their main, prime task was not the changing of the ruling class which was dictated by antagonistic contradictions but rather the gaining of statehood as such. That is why at the moment of the political victory of the national liberation movement it seemed that the internal class contradictions were completely lacking (only to later, in the postcolonial state, burst out on a new basis and with new strength).

Georgiy Ilich, you have posed an extremely important question: what are the boundaries of the national liberation revolution in the East? In actuality, should not all the cataclysms and changes there be considered as an ongoing revolution?

I agree that anticolonial revolutions differ in terms of the degree of violence. But not only in this. Certain revolutions were carried out in a compromise with imperialist forces and others in a decisive break with them. This means that in some instances the goal set for the revolution, that is, the establishing of their own statehood free of all forms of imperialist domination, was achieved while in others it was not. In other words, there is no absolute end point of the national liberation revolution in the East. Its length differs in various countries but this is a subject for analysis in the social structure of the forces driving the revolution.

G. Mirskiy: But is not a new revolution required in order that power end up in the hands of the forces interested in a consistent struggle against all types and vestiges of colonial and neocolonial suppression? The forms of revolution can vary, however in any event it will be, so to speak, a

(2) V. I. Lenin, PSS, Vol 31, p 133.

"revolution in a revolution." In other words, if one agrees with the thesis of an ongoing national liberation revolution lasting the entire age, then it must be admitted that for its final triumph in each nation presently following a capitalist path, there must be an "internal" social revolution. This would be that revolution in the narrow sense of the word mentioned initially.

G. Kim: Experience shows that a national liberation revolution is very diverse. This concept does not come down to elementary sociological formulas. It is essential to clearly distinguish its political and social aspects. The national liberation revolution as an anticolonial political coup is one thing. It can be said that in the East such a revolution has been successfully concluded. The transformation of social structures and social awareness is something else and without these complete national sovereignty is inconceivable. Moreover, due to the specific historical fate of the Eastern countries, the social coup contradictorily reconciles and "synthesizes" the formational transformations of two types: antifeudal and anticapitalist. In this sense the national liberation revolution in the East as before remains on the agenda. It not only destroys but also creates, it not only "clears away" prerevolutionary structures but also reforms them. What are your ideas on this issue, Vladimir Georgiyevich [Khoros]?

V. Khoros: I would like to emphasize the relative nature of the difference between the concepts of "revolution" and "reform" which usually are set rigidly in opposition to one another. Here are three examples. The English Bourgeois Revolution occurred in the mid-17th Century, but its most significant consequences came in the so-called "Silent Revolution," that is, in essence, in the reform of 1688, when the famous "Habeas Corpus Act" was approved and finally confirmed the primacy of Parliament over the Crown. A second example involves the period of the Bismarckian reforms "from above" which contributed decisively to the transition of Germany to bourgeois forms. Finally, Japan. During the Meiji Era, society was transformed from a feudal into a capitalist one and with good reason historians consider the Meiji Restoration an incomplete bourgeois revolution.

In my view, this is precisely how things stand in the present developing countries. After the comparatively mild revolution of 1911-1918 in Mexico, precisely the reforms of President L. Cardenas in the 1930's shook the system of feudal landowners. Radical agrarian reforms even under the conditions of authoritarian proimperialist regimes (in Taiwan and South Korea) provided a fundamental liquidation of the feudal orders in the countryside.

Moreover, revolution and reform are closely interrelated. Revolutions arise, as a rule, as a result of ineffective reforms. In Russia, the year 1861 gave rise to 1905 and 1917. In turn, revolutions contribute to successful social and political reforms. This happened in England where after the bourgeois revolution of the 17th Century a capitalist formation was established exclusively by reforms. In a number of European countries such as Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Belgium and so forth, the establishing of bourgeois orders, in particular parliamentary democracy, occurred generally without any revolutions as these were the "ripples on the water" after the French Revolution and the other bourgeois democratic revolutions in France. To put

it briefly, everything depends upon the specific conditions under which not only a revolution but also a reform can play a major social role.

N. Simoniya: I agree with Vladimir Georgiyevich that too rigid an opposition between "revolutions" and "reforms" is not always justified, as there are futile revolutions and revolutions which carry on their crest in no way revolutionary but rather retrograde political forces. At the same time, as V. I. Lenin repeatedly emphasized, history knows revolutionary reforms carried out from above both with the involvement and without the participation of the masses. However, the main thing, in my view, is in an understanding of the relationship between revolution and reform. It is particularly important to consider that reforms assume a revolutionary nature in the instance when either political revolutions either precede them or are fraught with a revolutionary situation, in other words, when these reforms are the direct continuation of the policy of the established revolutionary power or are measures forced on the politically reactionary ruling upper clique which under the pressure of certain circumstances for the purposes of self-defense and self-preservation initiates reforms that are revolutionary in their objective social importance.

G. Kim: But an equality sign must not be placed between both concepts, is it not so?

N. Simoniya: Yes, certainly. The dialectics of the historical process of mankind's development consists in the fact that reforms in and of themselves, taken outside of a link to revolution, are not capable of providing formational progress. Significant social consequences of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 which Vladimir Georgiyevich mentioned would have simply been impossible without the first English bourgeois revolution of the 17th Century. It was essential first of all to shatter the absolutist political superstructure in order for it then to be possible to peacefully prevent attempts at an essential royalist restoration and open up the path for freer development of bourgeois social relations.

The given circumstance is particularly important for understanding a revolution from above, that is, a political shift in the nature of power which is carried out by the ruling circles under the pressure of an already occurred but incomplete political revolution and after which major reforms of a bourgeois sort follow. Revolutions from above carried out by Bismarck in Germany or Cavour in Italy would have been simply impossible without the European revolution from below of 1848. Taking into account the derivative nature of a revolution from above from a revolution from below, the founders of Marxism-Leninism considered this phenomenon among the class of revolutions and not merely reforms.

V. Maksimenko: It seems to me that it has long been time to recognize that revolution and reforms are constants of social development or fundamentally equal methods of transforming reality. At the same time, an acute ideological struggle is underway over the question of their relationship.

Here, in my view, it is important to delimit two aspects. In the first place, this is essential as a dispute with the liberals who prefer evolutionary,

gradual, reformist paths as well as for combating the supporters of the "export of revolution." Secondly, we must, without relying too much on analogy and historical parallels, examine in detail the present mechanism of action of the revolutionary processes which differ in social content (or their nonrevolutionary alternatives) and the relationships of the specific classes and groups in a concrete developing society. Do you agree, Nodari Aleksandrovich [Simoniya]?

N. Simoniya: Certainly the diversity of the revolutionary process merits the closest attention. Thus, a revolution from above differs fundamentally from a revolution from below in terms of the nature of the forces participating in it (there are numerous examples when the masses have kept completely on the sidelines of transforming activity), in terms of the direct tactical goals, in terms of the form of social transformations, specific results and so forth. Moreover, a revolution from above is a reflection of a revolution from below, but a distorted reflection operating with traditionalist forces to the detriment of not only the workers but all the classes of the forming bourgeois society. Precisely these and other typological differences characteristic of a revolution from above explain the reasons why urgent social questions are resolved slowly and half-heartedly. As a result, a complex synthesis is formed of long-surviving essential elements of absolutism in the phase of early capitalist development as well as the political domination of these elements at least in the first stages of the formation of a bourgeois society.

But no matter how distortedly revolutions from below are reflected in the revolutions from above, this reflection is not of a formal nature (for the reaction is now carrying out the "program of the revolution" (3)). With a careful analysis of the specific revolutions from above, we will detect in them the appearance of certain very important elements which comprise the scientific concept of a "revolution," for example, a class shift and violence. Certainly these elements appear in a typologically different form. Thus, a class shift in the nature of power is marked by enormous uniqueness and initially has a half-hearted nature. It is expressed not in the complete but rather the partial destruction of the old structure of the absolutist state, that is, in the given instance there is a fundamentally different mechanism and a different scheme of the class shift in moving from the phase of absolutism to the phase of early capitalist development than in the pioneer capitalist countries.

V. Khoros: How do you specifically view the differences here?

N. Simoniya: The processes leading to a class shift as a result of a political revolution and counterrevolution occurred in the pioneer nations of capitalist development according to approximately the following scheme: a victorious political revolution from below (that is, the complete overthrow of absolutist power), the establishing of a republican order (rushing forward), the counterrevolutionary recoil and the formation of a compromise Bonapartist state as a synthesis of the feudal form and bourgeois content either as an authoritarian constitutional monarchy or a Bonapartist dictatorship.

(3) K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 13, p 432.

The same end result is achieved in the nations of the delayed development of capitalism (in the "secondary" model) in following a more complex and protracted path. In this instance the scheme appears approximately thus: an incomplete political revolution from below (absolutist power is not overthrown), the establishing of a constitutional monarchy (the rushing forward from the viewpoint of the maturity of the internal conditions), the counterrevolutionary recoil (a state coup from above), a new revolution or a crisis of the social structures, a revolution from above and the establishing of a complex synthesis of an absolutist-Bonapartist state (with the subsequent exceeding of Bonapartism over absolutism).

Thus, revolution from above in the second instance is an element in the mechanism of the class shift commenced by a political revolution from below. Undoubtedly, the researcher should see both the objectively progressive aspect of a revolution from above as well as the reactionary nature of its main participants. This will make it possible to avoid any extremes in assessing the given phenomenon. It is so easy to doubt the propinquity of the progressive and the reactionary, the revolutionary and the counterrevolutionary, while in real life and in the historical process these phenomena much more frequently and much oftener are intertwined than one usually imagines.

G. Kim: If I am not wrong, Semen Lvovich (Agayev), you support a somewhat different viewpoint.

S. Agayev: My position on this question has been criticized by both Nodari Aleksandrovich Simoniya in the collective monograph "Evolyutsiya vostochnykh obshchestv: sintez traditsionnogo i sovremennogo" [The Evolution of Eastern Societies: Synthesis of the Traditional and Modern] and by Vladimir Ilich Maksimenko in a review of one of my books and published in the journal NARODY AZII I AFRIKI. In the latter instance he opposed my view of revolution from above which the reviewer defined with the formula "reform by the means of revolution" using his own formula "revolution by means of reform."

G. Kim: Do you agree with such a line of reasoning?

S. Agayev: Both previously and now I would subscribe with equal decisiveness to both above-given formulas. A revolution from above is such a complex, contradictory and diverse phenomenon that, depending upon one's viewpoint, in it one can see both revolution and reform. I agree completely with Vladimir Georgiyevich [Khoros] who emphasized the relative nature of the difference between the two concepts and their close relationship. I would also like to recall that at one time Nodari Aleksandrovich with complete validity proposed in logical analysis that we divide social and political revolutions. Hence, it seems to me, that from this viewpoint a "revolution from above" is indisputably a revolution carried out by the means of reforms.

When we speak about a political revolution, that is, changes in the political superstructure, we have in mind a revolutionary policy and revolutionary means aimed against those who prevent the transforming of this superstructure. Undoubtedly, in the given instance a class shift is indispensable. But the first, main and basic feature of a political revolution, as was already

pointed out, is not merely such a shift (particularly a "half-hearted," "partial" one or "to the detriment of not only the workers but all the classes in a forming bourgeois society"), but the transfer of state power from the hands of one class to the hands of another.

It is also important to consider that the reaction carries out the program of a revolution and -- to an even greater degree -- that, in the expression of the founders of Marxism, "this program of the revolution in the hands of the reaction is turned into a satire of the corresponding revolutionary aspirations and thus becomes the most lethal weapon in the hands of an implacable enemy."⁽⁴⁾

V. Maksimenko: To a certain degree I cannot help but recognize your varacity, Semen Lvovich. Of course, the important thing is where the accent is placed: on the reaction which carries out the entire program of the revolution or on the program of the revolution which is carried out, regardless of this, by the reaction. However, whichever of the two sides of a revolution from above you take, the main thing is that the most dynamic elements of the reactionary upper classes successfully "intercept" the revolution. Deprived of a program for revolution, the masses for an extended period lose the historical initiative. Characteristically in the nations where a revolution from above fully succeeded (Germany and Japan), Nazism and militarism were the price paid for sterilizing the social activity of the lower classes.

S. Agayev: Precisely so. Permit me to finish my thought. Nodari Aleksandrovich proposed two interesting and most likely generally correct schemes for understanding the level of a class shift in the countries of the "primary" and "secondary" models. But certainly it is equally important to consider those changes in the essence of the social transformations which determine the given balance of revolution and reform? These changes are determined by a series of factors, including by the relationship of developmental patterns inherent to capitalism as a world system and to national capitalism in the individual countries. It is also essential to view the development of the corresponding nation within the context of the age of social revolution. Finally, one cannot help but consider the structural changes in the revolutions from above, the historical levels of their development in various stages of social and technical-economic progress. The proposal of Vladimir Ilich Maksimenko to rely not so much on analogy and historical parallels as on concrete historical, including situational, analysis is dictated, from my viewpoint, by healthy considerations.

G. Kim: But what about the above-mentioned circumstance that the founders of Marxism-Leninism considered the designated phenomenon (a revolution from above) among revolutions (and not merely reforms) and employed the corresponding terminology?

S. Agayev: Vladimir Georgiyevich [Khoros], having mentioned the events of the 1860's and 1870's in Japan, said that historians consider them an "incomplete

(4) K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 13, p 432.

bourgeois revolution." However, it seems to me, that this formula actually follows "by inertia," so to speak, out of the historiographic tradition. Academician Ye. M. Zhukov who stood at the sources of the genesis of the corresponding view in his last works abandoned the designated formula. At present, there is an ever-clearer tendency to interpret Lenin's note "1866-1871: Japan. (Revolution and Transformations.)," (5) considering the delimitation in it of both concepts "revolution" and "transformations" as the characteristics of the inner structure of a single whole. But an overall assessment of this whole requires from us an elucidation of the specific relationship between these concepts as well as the creation of an adequate theoretical model. The factual material provides grounds to propose a specific relationship of revolution and reform in the form of the relationship of form and content, methods and goals.

V. Khoros: You touched upon the specific features of the so-called "primary" and "secondary" models. The developing countries are, if one can express it so, a "tertiary" model, a third echelon of bourgeois development in relation to the Euro-American regions and the second echelon of world capitalism (Russia, Japan, the Balkans, Brazil and Argentina). Inherent to these countries to a particular degree are the contradictions and antagonisms of delayed bourgeois development caused by imperialist suppression, by the uncohesiveness of the bourgeois (to a significant degree imported from outside) sector and the prebourgeois systems, and by the presence of traditional or semitradeional social masses which are still "unready" for modernization. Thus, on the one hand, we see that in these countries the main formational prerequisites have not yet come into being for the development of capitalism, including the economic, social, legal, political and cultural ones. On the other hand, in a society undergoing serious social clashes, the enormous masses of disenfranchised population are permeated by explosive, radicalist moods. Finally, the world socialist system and the international communist movement have an extremely strong impact and they sharply intensify the anticapitalist trends.

This gives rise to a discrepancy between the subjective and objective factors of the revolutionary process in the area of the national liberation movement. The drive of the revolutionary vanguard for radical changes on its path encounters still immature opportunities for such changes. Many socialist-oriented countries have encountered these difficulties. Also related to this are the failures of various revolutions from above in Asian and African countries and the abundance of military coups which in essence change little, the degeneration of progressive regimes, the phenomenon of "reactionary revolutions" and a number of other problems.

G. Mirskiy: I will continue the thought of Vladimir Georgiyevich.

In our literature often externally logical but somewhat abstract and schematic constructs of the revolutionary process in the developing world are proposed and according to these the following are occurring: a) national-liberation

(5) V. I. Lenin, PSS, Vol 28, p 671.

revolutions, that is, anticolonial and general national ones, b) national democratic revolutions which are almost purely social but are in a way intermediate and halfway, with the participation of the bourgeoisie under the leadership of revolutionary democracy and c) people's democratic revolutions headed by vanguard parties which shift to positions of scientific socialism.

The logicalness and order of the given scheme (which is theoretically, possibly, flawless) are disrupted, however, in looking at the real course of events. Certainly each subsequent type of revolution should "grow" out of the preceding one and as a whole a revolution seemingly rises to ever-higher levels. But the transition of a revolution from type "b" to type "c" is still far from its final realization, certainly not all revolutionary democrats have switched to Marxist positions and a state of national democracy did not grow into a people's democratic one.

Those revolutions which are usually termed national democratic occurred in countries which were often styled "first generation" socialist-oriented countries. What has been their fate? In Egypt, Guinea, Somali and other countries the sociopolitical forces which opted in favor of socialism have been defeated. The state of national democracy (if one proceeds from the assumption that it was established there) collapsed or degenerated. In Algeria, Syria, Iraq, Burma and Tanzania, the forces which came to power and were called a revolutionary democracy have retained this power but have not shown any evidence of a transition to the ideological positions of scientific socialism or Marxism.

V. Khoros: It seems to me that you are excessively categorical, Georgiy Ilich. In terms of the revolutionary forces providing leadership in South Yemen and Ethiopia, as well as in terms of certain other vanguard worker parties, one can clearly speak about the traits of "development" or a transition from the national democratic revolution to a people's democratic one. Something similar happened once in Cuba and is now occurring in Nicaragua. But I would agree that the concept of "development" here is tantamount not to any major shift but rather to changes of a subjective sort in the ideological views of the leaders, in the organizational principles of party construction and so forth.

G. Mirskiy: Generally for such a conclusion (on the possibility and actuality of such "development") one must draw upon more factual and theoretical material than we usually do. But I would like to return to the nonoccurring "development" using the example of the first generation revolutionary democracy.

I recall a scheme which we developed immediately after the collapse of the colonial system. It was approximately as follows: After the liberation from the political domination of the colonialists, along with a struggle for economic independence, an internal class struggle would develop; nationwide unity would come to an end as soon as the foreign suppressors had been expelled and the local exploiters and working masses would remain face to face.

These forecasts did not come about and, as is now clear, almost nowhere had

any chance of coming about. The described scheme was based on "viewing the East through European glasses," that is, an approach to Asian and African society which did not draw a substantial distinction between these and Western society with its two basic classes which had already been analyzed by K. Marx and with other features not inherent to the colonies. Only gradually did life force us to realize that both these classes -- the proletariat and the bourgeoisie -- are not the main ones in a backward society.

It became ever-clearer that the main, dichotomous lines of class conflict taken from European history, that is, peasant against feudal lord, proletariat against bourgeoisie, in the Afro-Asian societies were "smeared," concealed and pushed back by infinite divisions not along class lines but rather of a national-ethnic, tribal, religious, caste and cliental nature. It became clear that in a mosaic-like, fractured society which still largely had a precapitalist nature, where no class as yet had the possibility of becoming dominant, class warfare of the historically known type, that is, "class against class," could not hold the central place in sociopolitical life.

G. Kim: Excuse me for the interruption, but even in European countries the revolutionary struggle did not presuppose a "class against class" scheme.

G. Mirskiy: Quite right. Precisely this forces us to conclude that the sociopolitical struggle which actually developed, as we assumed, after the reaching of independence in the liberated countries only hypothetically could be termed class struggle.

Let us recall the end of the 1940's, the end of the 1950's and the beginning of the 1960's with several leftist movements, mass actions and outbursts of radicalism, what activity by the progressive forces and primarily the communists and organizations of kindred spirit. Let us recall what happened in Egypt, Syria, Iran, Sudan and Indonesia.... But the outbursts of social energy, if they did not bring about a result, were replaced by a decline and by a loss of interest in politics. A period of stability set in and, unfortunately, representatives of the bourgeois-bureaucratic and militaristic-technocratic elite came to power in a majority of the countries. Only in a small number of Asian and African countries were truly popular, profound and socialistically aimed revolutions victorious, only in several nations are such revolutions, possibly, gradually getting underway now and, finally, in a small group of nations entrenched in power were forces which carried out a national democratic revolution and formed a system which has no analog in history and possessed numerous features of state capitalism. This, of course, was also a revolution, this was progress in comparison with what had been before, however numerous problems exist on the path of noncapitalist development for these systems.

V. Maksimenko: Georgiy Ilich, as I understand it, you doubt that the social struggle which broke out in the developing countries during the first postcolonial stage had a class nature. Yes, there are no direct analogs in European experience. However, I give a different meaning to the same facts: this was a struggle between different basic classes than in a developed society, with a different relationship of elements of a class and nonclass nature.

Let us take the same first-generation revolutionary democracy. In its activities there was a contradiction which was inseparable from its social essence. On the one hand, the socialistically tinted state ideology, a conscious demarcation from the economic and political practices of capitalism and bourgeois democracy, and on the other, a difference with Marxism-Leninism and the restricting or suppressing of the communist and other leftist groupings within the country.

The socialist-oriented forces of the first generation -- and this is essentially important for their description -- fostered the ideological illusion of a nonclass path to socialism. Hence the models of different but typologically homogeneous "unique" national socialisms.

Is it possible to say (employing Lenin's description) that the non-Marxist socialism of the first generation of revolutionary democracy was "subjective socialism" and that it had a "pseudosocialist" nature and that the revolutionary democrats expressed "the interests and viewpoint of the broad masses of peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie" and clothed their activities "in a more or less hazy socialist ideology," in endeavoring to carry out "essentially bourgeois, democratic" tasks?(b)

Considering the nature of the national liberation revolution of the 20th Century which has brought together antifeudal and anticapitalist social coups the answer is obviously yes (which does not nullify the positive results achieved by "subjective socialism" in national state construction).

What is the main contradiction which has prepared the downfall of a number of Afro-Asian regimes which have taken up the ideology of non-Marxist socialism? The more energetic the socioeconomic changes in revolutionary democratic power the quicker new class forces were formed and the more aggressively they acted. These were hostile to any socialist ideals and included the new entrepreneurial elements in the countryside (a product of the agrarian reforms) and the technobureaucratic ruling stratum which feverishly capitalized on its legal and illegal income (the product of the development of the state capitalist sector and the swelling of administrative structures).

I feel that present-day analysis not of the ideological features but precisely the class nature of power in the socialist oriented countries (power that is inevitably coalition and compromise) and likewise consideration that the boundary between power and opposition, between progress and reaction in these countries often runs inside the ruling revolutionary-democratic bloc would make it possible to better spot the first indications of counterrevolution or "Thermidorian" development which was the fate of the first generation revolutionary democrats.

N. Simoniya: I would like to dispute those authors who too broadly interpret the concept of a "revolution from above," extending it to historical phenomena which actually do not go beyond the limits of reforms. It is a question of

(b) V. I. Lenin, PSS, Vol 21, p 403; Vol 12, p 233.

the transformations carried out almost exclusively under the influence of foreign examples, sometimes voluntarily and sometimes confronted with an external threat. But such reforms even objectively did not contain any essential element of a "political revolution," since they marked a transition to a new phase within or within the limits of the given formation. With good reason the founders of Marxism-Leninism employed the term "revolution from above" exclusively for those historical situations when there was a transition from an absolutist state to a Bonapartist one, that is, for the situations of an interformational transition). This is not surprising as with the transition from phase to phase within the feudal formation there were no fundamental changes or shifts in the political structure (there was only a modification of it), and for this reason political revolutions were not required either "from above" or "from below."

S. Agayev: Nodari Aleksandrovich clearly has in mind the reforms of Stein and Hardenberg in 1807-1811 in Prussia and the reforms of the 1860's in Russia. The fact that these and similar reforms were undertaken under the influence of foreign examples under prerevolutionary historical conditions still does not mean that they were not caused by a revolution. The threat of a Napoleonic invasion of Prussia entailed more profound revolutionary perturbations than revolutions from below. In Russia, as is known, a revolutionary situation had come into being by the 1860's.

Moreover, the carrying out of such major reforms which put the development of the corresponding countries on a path of capitalism shows the presence in them of such an essential element in the concept of "political revolution" as a class shift.

I do not agree that these reforms merely opened up a new phase within or in the limits of the given feudal sort of formational development. The transition to an absolutist state created definite differences between this new political superstructure and the classic-type absolutism. The German states of the 1820's and 1830's were described by F. Engels not as feudal ones but rather "semifeudal" and "bureaucratic monarchies." The political superstructure in Russia which in 1861 took its first step along the path of changing from a feudal monarchy to a bourgeois monarchy was described by V. I. Lenin as a "semifeudal autocracy." Does this not bespeak a change in the role and place of absolutism as a stage of social development or, more accurately, a formational "shift" in the transitional period from feudalism to capitalism? In any event, the factual material accumulated by historical science does not provide any grounds to move the "situation of interformational transition" in Germany back to the times of the Bismarck transformations and in Russia to the start of the Stolypin reforms.

Not without interest in this context is the historical development of the eastern countries. The transition from feudal despotism to a semifeudal absolutism which occurred in Japan after the "Meiji Restoration" resolved a most important and major task in the bourgeois transformation of the economic base and the political superstructure. In contrast to classic absolutism and the final stage in the development of feudalism, the Japanese semifeudal absolutism marked the entry of the society into the initial stage of a bourgeois social coup. Even more clearly than in Germany and Russia this

disclosed the characteristic traits of the dictatorship of the semifeudal landowners and the developing bourgeoisie.

An analogous phenomenon, although certainly in a somewhat different form, occurred, for example, in Iran in the mid-1920's. The semifeudal absolute monarchy which arose here became the political superstructure for the initial stage of capitalist development.

V. Khoros: Allow me, Semen Lvovich, to interrupt you here. It seems to me that the Iranian Revolution at the end of the 1970's shows best of all the complexity of the relationship of reform and revolution in the developing countries. As is known, it was a reaction to the reforms of the Shah period which, on the one hand, led to antifeudal measures and forced modernization of Iranian society and, on the other, to a stronger dependence upon the imperialist West and the exacerbation of social contradictions. The result was the powerful "Islamic explosion" which was a broad popular movement under the leadership of the Moslem clergy. Having first shown militant antimonarchist and antiimperialist tendencies, the Iranian Revolution then bogged down in Shiite theocracy and traditionalism. The level of economic and political life in the nation not only does not surpass this indicator from the period of the Shah's reforms (the "White Revolution") but for a number of parameters (for example, in terms of the actual debunking of the republic system the basic institutions of which are under the full control of the clergy) represents a step backwards.

Events in Iran show one other particular feature which complicates the revolutionary process in the developing countries. A common trait in the countries of delayed, dependent, "tertiary" capitalism is the slowness and deformed nature of the class formation process, the presence of an enormous mass of intermediate strata, marginal elements and social lower classes which stand on the sidelines of the uneven, spotty modernization.

Precisely the urban "crowd," the former migrants from the countryside and now unemployed lumpens and other marginal groups have become the main social support for the theocratic regime, the "soldiers of Khomeini" and "guards of the revolution" who are always ready to participate in demonstrations in front of one or another foreign embassy, to "purge" those who do not agree, to confiscate and to arrest. As long as these strata survive the possibility remains of manipulating them (more often, certainly, to the right than to the left), and with their aid check the demands of other classes which are more developed in terms of their social status and their awareness.

N. Simoniya: When you, Vladimir Georgiyevich, say that this revolution was initially an antimonarchic and antiimperialist one and then bogged down in the cloudy theocratic course, this is not quite sufficient for assessing the Iranian events. In the first place, in Iran there was no unified and uniform antimonarchism. The revolution -- on the upswing and on the downswing -- brought together different (socially different) trends of antimonarchism and antiimperialism. At the start of the revolution, the traditionalist strata of the population comprised the main and most massive shock force for it and this explains the comparative ease with which the theocratic forces were able to impose their leadership on the nation. Secondly, the Shah himself embodied

trends of different formations. Such a phenomenon was frequently encountered in the historical past. For instance, one might recall the characteristics of the very contradictory historical personage of Oliver Cromwell who was described by F. Engels as follows: "Cromwell combines Robespierre and Napoleon in a single person."⁽⁷⁾ The Shah of Iran during the last two decades of his rule was an even more contradictory figure. Initially inherent to him were absolutist and Bonapartist views which were combined with the traits of an Iranian state leader and the latter circumstance was particularly important as a consequence of the essential shift in the nature of political power (the actual dispersal of one-half of the semifeudal mejlis and the instituting of the omnipotent bourgeois-oriented bureaucracy).

The dualistic nature of the state in Germany and Italy was embodied by two different political principals. Thus, the traits of Bonapartism in these countries were reflected in the strong prime ministers of Bismarck and Cavour and absolutism in Emperor Wilhelm and King Emmanuel. Initially one might have assumed that the unification of both trends in the person of the Shah would substantially ease his realization of the Bonapartist line. But the obvious predominance of this line and the national-state and socioeconomic centralization inevitably related to it caused a stormy response among the Shiite clergy and other, special-interest traditional forces. This had to be suppressed by force.

V. Maksimenko: It seems to me that the Iranian Revolution has yet another important feature which is sometimes overlooked. Incidentally, this depends upon the interpretation.

On the pages of the journal it has been pointed out that the political movements under religious slogans are a phenomenon inherent to all peoples at a certain stage of their development. The unusual feature is something else: the Iranian Revolution was the world's first bourgeois democratic revolution where politically organized Islam was the leading force of the movement and the sovereign disposer of postrevolutionary power (in certain stages together with the non-Islamic forces of Iranian liberalism and democracy). Events in Iran showed that under certain conditions Islam (with all its inherent elements of fanaticism and dogmatic narrowness) can be a completely modern civil force.

If the monopolistic and state monopolistic forms of production implanted "from above" under the old regime are the most advanced phase of socialization under capitalism, the 1979 revolution in Iran marked the start of the transition of the social rear areas to a path of more balanced, more "democratic" but also capitalist development.

Islam, it seems to me, during this revolution was not an epiphenomenon, not an exotic ideological addendum to the revolutionary process but one of the most essential organic elements inseparable from the shifts and shakes which occurred in Iran.

(7) K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 2, p 602.

In contrast to those who emphasize the "immanent" properties of Islam and the tyrant-fighting and martyr-like predisposition of Shiism, I would like to point out a new quality in the revolutionary process in the East which became apparent in the 1970's, in particular, in Iran: 1) a certain exhaustion at the present stage in the potential of the revolutions from above (precisely as a revolutionary and not a reformist method of capitalist modernization; 2) a sharp increase in the human mass drawn into the processes of social fermentation, agitation and dissatisfaction when the number of participants in a movement runs into the millions.

Under these conditions, tradition, including religious, can become and is becoming a "language" of truly mass social protest, an elementary and easily accessible language which can express the latent aspirations of the disenfranchised.

N. Simoniya: In my view, you, Vladimir Ilich, have overlooked one important circumstance. The Shiite clergy in its mass (with the exception of individual leaders and small fractions) from the very outset acted from retrograde positions. Precisely the ignoring or miscomprehension of this fact has led to illusions and the disorientation of virtually all the revolutionary forces from the consistently leftist and democratic to the liberal rightist nationalists and has prevented them from joining in a common front based not only on antimonarchism but also on the desire not to permit the establishing of a fundamentalist theocratic regime. For such errors one must pay too high a price. Here I agree with Vladimir Georgiyevich that the abrupt change assumed by revolutionary events in Iran was the equivalent of a retreat even in comparison with the socioeconomic level achieved under the Shah's regime.

S. Agayev: For me, as an Iranian scholar, it is difficult to refrain from participating in a discussion of the problems of the Iranian Revolution. But, since too much time has already been given to it, I will limit myself to two comments. In the first place, as it seems to me, the virtually universal opinion of a "retreat" or "recoil" has been brought about, in particular, by the fact that we at times subconsciously apply the schemes of classic bourgeois revolutions to the Iranian events. We do not always consider that the dead-end nature of capitalist development in the East entails a corresponding revolutionary process of such a nature. Secondly, I would like to caution against excessive hurry in assessing the current Iranian regime. Clearly, if it is unable to find precise guidelines for further internal evolution conforming to the interests of "democratic" capital, then in any event it will become an intermediate link on the path of creating a structure from which it will be possible to judge more soundly the ultimate outcome of the Iranian Revolution. This is why I agree with the opinion voiced here about the "reform of the social rear areas."

G. Kim: The Iranian Revolution has provided the researcher with much that is instructive. But still, I feel, the time has not yet come of giving categorical judgments, although in terms of our discussion certain conclusions could be drawn even now.

V. Khoros: I would like to point out a definite, it seems to me, rise in the importance of social and political reforms in the liberated states at present.

This is due, as was pointed out by the discussion's participants, with objective difficulties on the path of revolutions, particularly at the present stage. Reform does not necessarily mean a palliative and it can encourage significant social and political shifts. In this sense all of us here, it seems, are agreed that the distinction between reform and revolution is not an absolute one. Moreover, there is a difference between insignificant, elitist reforms and reforms caused by pressure from below, by a mass movement, by political changes in one or another country. In this instance a reform in no way means the curtailment of the revolutionary process in the developing countries. On the contrary, it can be its component part and particular phase. The possibility of controlling a reform, planning it and carrying it out gradually and on a "limited basis," makes it historically useful under the conditions of the developing countries.

G. Kim: From the discussion we can see that our orientalist thought is not standing still. And what is particularly important, the fundamental questions of social development in the East are within the perusal of our scientists. The political map of the developing countries is constantly changing. This requires close attention to their concrete social practices and to the processes occurring there.

What ideas has the debate aroused?

The real, historically changing relationship between revolution and reform in the East is one of those fundamental general questions the lack of an answer to which prevents us from correctly solving many particular problems. The roundtable, obviously, was unable to encompass the unemcompassable. Let me endeavor to isolate those areas which, in my view, require further profound elaboration. Among these are the questions of the historiography of the 20th Century revolutions, including the national liberation ones; the questions of the activities of the Sotsintern [Socialist International] in the East, one of those variables which under present-day conditions is reflected on the balance of forces of revolution and reform. A number of questions is related to the diverse potential of developing capitalism in the Asian countries which leaves a choice between the more reactionary and more "democratic" paths. In this context we must clarify and concretize certain of our views on the social structure of the developing countries. Last but not least there is the problem of the ideological "renaissance" of traditionalism in the East. We still do not distinguish with sufficient clarity the dialectics of the intertwining in it of conservative, reformist and objectively revolutionizing trends.

Let us hope that these and other problems will be reflected in our further works and debates on the ways and forms of the revolutionary process in the East.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya". 1985

Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

10272

CSO: 1807/036

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

NAMIBIAN PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT DISCUSSED

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 9, Sep 85 pp 32-33

[Article by V. Bushin under the rubric "Against Apartheid and Racism": "Namibia: 'Who Are Temporary Here?..' (On the New Trick of the South African Racists)"]

[Text] On 17 June 1985, in the Tintinpalast building in Windhoek, where the headquarters of the South African colonial administration is located, a ceremony was held of the transfer of power to the so-called provisional government of Namibia. The ceremony was held in the presence of the South African President P. Botha and the Defense Minister, Gen M. Malan. On the same day at the local stadium a magnificent celebration was held. Coming there by bus from various regions of the country were the supporters of the "multiparty conference," a coalition of "White" as well as conciliatory "Black" organizations and parties in order to demonstrate mass support for the new "government." In order to attract viewers a real show was put on with the direct involvement of the South African occupation forces including a parade of ground troops and aviation, a paratrooper landing, a choral performance and a football match. Food and drink were distributed gratis to all comers.

Quite different events developed at that very time in Katutura, the African ghetto of Windhoek. Special police detachments to combat "disorders," having employed tear gas and clubs, here broke up a mass protest meeting against the farce organized by the racists. Around 70 persons were wounded.

The Vice President of the Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO)(1) Daniel Tiongarero rightly commented on this that the first action of the "government" which is not supported by the people and was not elected by them was an act of police violence. Incidentally, certain members of the "cabinet" asserted that they knew nothing about this operation ahead of time. Possibly that is true. Certainly they are not the masters in the country.

In reading the announcement about the "transfer of power" in Windhoek, one automatically recalls that something similar occurred several years ago. In

(1) For the activities of SWAPO, see Yu. Gorbunov, "SWAPO: A Quarter of Century of Struggle," AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 4, 1985.

actuality, in 1978, after pseudoelections held under the control of the South African occupation forces, the racists established a "constituent assembly" which later was renamed the "national assembly." In 1979, a "consultative council" was formed under the chairmanship of one of the leaders of the white settlers, Dirk Mudge (from 1980, the council began to be called even the "council of ministers").

However, the squabbles among the members of the "assembly" and "council" who were unable to gain any significant support among the population forced South Africa in 1983 to disban the quasiparliament and quasigovernment.

Instead, as a new step along the path of establishing a puppet neocolonialist regime in Namibia, in November 1983, a "multiparty conference" was convened. But again differences soon began between the representatives of the so-called "domestic parties" which were involved in its work. Leaving the conference was the Damara Council, the main political grouping of this nationality. It was also left by a portion of the members from the Southwest African National Union (SWANU) Party which had some influence among the Herero. The Party of Christian Democratic Action which claims to represent the largest nationality in the nation, the Ovambo, completely refrained from participation in the conference.

What remained of it? The Tuirnhalle Democratic Alliance (DTA) headed by the ex-"premier" D. Mudge (including, in turn, 11 "parties"), the rightist party of whites, the Nationalist Party, a portion of SWANU, a grouping of renegades from the national liberation movement styling itself "SWAPO democrats," and two small parties of the colored population. Even the Western mass information media who in no way sympathize with the fighters for true Namibian independence admitted that all 16 of these "parties" taken together could scarcely provide support of 15 percent of the nation's population and half of this contingent was whites.

For giving greater respectability to the puppet bodies, along with the "cabinet," a "legislative assembly" was established the membership of which was also set in Pretoria: 22 persons from the DTA and 8 each from the other members of the "multiparty conference." Just how representative this "assembly" is can be judged from the statement of P. Botha himself who recognized that it "does not have a mandate from the people." The racists decided not to hold new elections. The conclusion of the farce was the establishing of a "constitutional council" headed by white lawyers from South Africa.

Who are these people who are humbly named "ministers" and "assembly members"?

Intended as "premier" was Moses Katjuilongwa who considers himself the president of SWANU. The fact that the head of the "cabinet" would be a black and not a white like Dirk Mudge was to show the changes and the fundamental difference of the "provisional government" from the "council of ministers." However, at the last moment Pretoria preferred to completely dispense with such a post and the members of the "government" would hold the chairmanship in turn. The first to perform these duties was David Besuidenhut, the leader of

the Labor Party which represents only a portion of the small colored population of the nation.

Possibly Pretoria changed its plans due to the continuing disputes inside the "multiparty conference." The right wing of the white community, the Nationalists, for example, did not want to always see an African at the head of the government. Probably another circumstance was at work: the candidate for "premier" had too shaky positions even in his own party.

M. Katjuiongwa became the president of SWANU only in 1982, having arrived from Sweden where he had lived for many years, while the Namibian patriots were waging an heroic struggle for independence. And he returned precisely when for a neocolonialist solution to the Namibian problem they needed black collaborators who were ready to betray the interests of their people for the sake of personal gain. But the overt course of M. Katjuiongwa of collaborating with the racists caused sharp opposition from a majority of the SWANU members. In September 1984, a party congress which adopted a decision to collaborate with SWAPO retired the president. SWANU was split and the supporters of the racists was in a minority, although with the direct support of the South Africans he was able to keep the headquarters building under his control.

An equally odious figure is Fanuel Kozonguizi who also at one time was the president of SWANU. Participants of the Afro-Asian solidarity movement may recall that in 1967, when his party was expelled from the members of the AAPSO, Kozonguizi stated that in 6 months he would be seen in Namibia fighting for freedom with weapons in hand. However, he did not go back home but rather to England. In truth, in the mid-1970's, he actually did return to Namibia, but not as a fighter but in the role of an advisor to the "constitutional conference" convened by the racists. During the period of the formation of the present "provisional government," he remained a collaborator with the colonial administration.

Let us mention one other "president," A. Shipanga who heads the group of "SWAPO democrats." At one time he was a member of SWAPO and even was on its executive committee, but completely discredited himself as an amoral and dishonest person. Having felt that he no longer had any place in the organization of freedom fighters, Shipanga with the aid of the Western special services endeavored in 1976 to organize a conspiracy in the aim of overthrowing the SWAPO leadership, but was unmasked and expelled from its ranks in shame. Returning with the knowledge and aid of the colonial powers from abroad, he began to put together his own political grouping under the same name and again was unsuccessful as the patriots quickly understood his treacherous role. Shipanga's attempt to profit from his old acquaintance with the SWAPO General Secretary Andimboy Roivo ia Toivo also failed. After liberation from racist imprisonment in March 1984, Toivo simply refused to meet the renegade although he was waiting at the prison gates.

The last of the Africans in the "cabinet" is A. Matjila who has worked directly in the offices of the South African administrator general in Namibia. The remaining members of the "government" are the same Dirk Mudge, the leader of the white nationalists Eben Van Zyl and a representative of one of the

colored groups, the Rehoboths, G. Dirgaardt.

The Pretorian authorities have endeavored to depict the slight-of-hand of creating a "cabinet," "assembly" and so forth which is a flagrant violation of the Resolution 435 of the UN Security Council and other decisions of this organization relating to Namibia as a response to the request of the very participants of the "multiparty conference." They also talk about a desire to escape from the financial burden of expenditures on maintaining the colonial apparatus and for armed actions in Namibia. It would be a praiseworthy wish if power were actually turned over to the people and if they halted the plundering of the nation's natural riches which brings the racists income incommensurate with their expenditures.

But, even following the path of a neocolonialist solution to the Namibian problem, Pretoria has refused the "provisional government" its most important prerogatives, that is, the right to resolve questions of defense and security and also to maintain international ties. The post of the South African administrator general has not been abolished although some of the new-fledged "rulers" planned on this.

The new trick of the racists has evoked sharp protest in the international community. In a resolution the UN Security Council condemned South Africa for continuing the occupation of Namibia, it confirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and independence and voiced serious concern over the growing threat to security in the south of Africa as a result of the use of Namibia by the racists as a staging area for military operations against African states and the destabilizing of their regimes. We would point out that the United States and Great Britain, not daring to veto the draft resolution, at the same time did not condemn South Africa as they abstained from voting.

In realizing that it was impossible to maintain colonial rule in the old forms, South Africa has endeavored as quickly as possible to "Namibize" its administration and the repressive punitive apparatus in the country illegally occupied by it. Thus, from October 1984, there has been the compulsory registration of men, both white and black, from the age of 17 to 55, in the aim of recruiting them into the "Southwest African Territorial Forces" which are under the command of South African generals and officers. This is aimed at a dual goal: to weaken the dissatisfaction of the South African white population with the growing losses in a colonial war and at the same time to depict it as a "civil war" between the Namibians themselves.

Measures are being taken to broaden the social support for the puppet regime by establishing a "black middle class" from the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, merchants and embourgeoisied tribal leaders. Here Pretoria is counting on active support from the West. For example, as was stated recently by the SWAPO President Sam Nujoma, the West German Konrad Adenauer Fund which is closely tied to the Christian Democratic Party has received 12 million marks from the Federal Ministry of Economic Collaboration for "strengthening the puppets who are carrying out traitorous actions against the Namibian people." West German lawyers have also participated in working out a draft "constitution" for the puppet state.

Under the existing situation, the SWAPO leadership feels that the response to the maneuvers of the racists and their imperialist patrons should be a broadening of the liberation struggle in all its forms, including armed resistance. Just in March-April of this year, fighters of the Namibian People's Liberation Army destroyed over 300 enemy soldiers and wounded 340 in the course of battles in the areas of Ondangwa, Olanakati and Enguena.

All the freedom-loving forces of the world are on the side of the Namibian patriots. As was emphasized in the TASS Statement of 26 June 1985, "the struggle of the Namibian people headed by SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, for national independence, for halting the occupation of the nation, against the attempts of the South African racist regime and its Western patrons to impose a neocolonialist regime on Namibia in the future will be supported by the Soviet Union."

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya". 1985
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

10272

CSO: 1807/036

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

ZIONIST COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE SCORED (PART 3)

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 9, Sep 85 pp 34-38

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences D. Prokofyev: "The Great Plundering of the Palestinians"; the third article in a series; for the first and second see AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 7 and 8 1985]

[Text] Zionism arose at the end of the 19th Century, at the end of the colonial age and the dawn of the age of the national liberation of colonial peoples. For this reason, it could become either the last colonial undertaking of Europe or the first national liberation movement of the "Third World." Unfortunately, in analyzing the record, it must be stated that precisely the first assumption was the correct one and the Zionists were the younger brothers of the colonizers of India, the white settlers in South Africa and those who exterminated the Indian tribes in America.

Uri Avneri, "The Time of the Whites,"
AOLAM AZE, 5 December 1984

In June 1967, the Israeli Army launched a surprise attack against three neighboring countries, Egypt, Jordan and Syria. Catching the Arabs by surprise, Israel captured the West Bank of Jordan, the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights. All these territories (with the exception of the Sinai which was returned to Egypt under the separate Camp David Accord) are presently under Israeli occupation.

A majority of historians abroad, including those who were rather critical of the colonial undertakings of Zionism, support the opinion that the occupation of Arab lands for long years was not planned previously and the Zionist authorities initially intended to use the captured lands merely as a bargaining chip for putting pressure on the Arabs. For example, Uzi Narkis (at the end of the 1960's, he was one of the closest assistants of M. Dayan) has stated that "the strengthening of the occupation during the first years was not planned and was scarcely the 'secret wish' of the Israeli leaders."⁽¹⁾ Only in the first half of the 1970's, when they had become convinced that the Arabs would not sign a truce under Israeli conditions in exchange for the

return of the territories did practical steps begin to be taken to perpetuate the occupation.

Uri Avneri maintains a similar position. He feels that the sole aim of the Israeli leaders in 1967 was to attack the antiimperialist, anti-American regimes in the Arab world and undermine their positions in the Near East. Only later did the plan appear of actual annexation of the captured lands.(2) In confirmation of such a viewpoint two main arguments are advanced: in the first place, the Israeli authorities in 1967 recognized Resolution 242 of the UN Security Council and, secondly, what was later termed "creeping annexation" (a gradual change in the demographic make-up of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip) did not begin immediately after the capture of these territories but approximately 5 years later.

However, it seems to us that the existing facts must be interpreted differently. In actuality, the Israeli government recognized Resolution 242 which demanded the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territory, but the Knesset at the same time adopted a decision on the extension of Israeli jurisdiction to the Arab sector of Jerusalem, flagrantly in violation of this resolution. It is also true that practical actions to alter the demographic composition of the occupied territories started only several years after the 1967 aggression. However, prior to this the Israeli authorities did a good deal of work to establish the legal bases for future "creeping annexation." Even during the first 5 years of occupation, several-score laws and decrees were adopted and on the basis of these at present thousands of dunams (a measure of land) of Arab lands are being confiscated and colonial settlements established.

In order to understand the dynamics of the colonizing process on the occupied territories, it must be considered that in the Israeli establishment there are at least three substantially different approaches to the problem of colonization.

A certain portion of the ruling circles (represented in the political arena by the social reformist Maarah bloc) prefers neocolonial methods of enslavement, that is, without repudiating annexation in principle, it has endeavored not to annex regions where a majority of the Arab population is concentrated and to tie them to Israel economically. Here the aim is to turn the occupied territories into a market for Israeli products and the Palestinians themselves into a cheap labor force at the Israeli enterprises. The other wing (represented by the right-bourgeois Likud bloc and the religious parties) is in favor of a sort of "bantustanization" of the occupied territories and turning them into reservations for the Arab "natives" under full Israeli military-political control. Finally, the third, most extremist group (the Thia and Morasha parties, the Kakh and the rightist extremist organizations of the settlers) has called for the annexation of all occupied territories and the expulsion of a majority of the Palestinian population.

Undoubtedly, all three ways are colonialist and expansionist. But to a significant degree they pursue different aims and for this reason presuppose completely different methods. The process of the "grand larceny of the Palestinians" on the occupied territories cannot be examined without

considering the constant struggle between these three approaches of the Zionists to colonization.

Economic Suffocation and the "Slave Markets"

The minimum program for the Zionist circles on the question of the occupied territories is the converting of the Arabs into a cheap and disenfranchised labor force for the Israeli economy. On this point the opponents of formal annexation and its supporters agree. For this reason, in this area colonial policy has been carried out most consistently and the process has gone quite far. "The directed Israeli policy which has been carried out for all 17 years of occupation has led to the actual merging of the economy in the occupied territories with the Israeli," pointed out the Israeli sociologist Euda Litani on this question. "The Israeli authorities have carried out this policy partially out of political considerations (in order not to allow the establishing of a Palestinian state) and partially out of economic considerations due to the appetites of the Israeli entrepreneurs and firms which are endeavoring to capture new markets where there is virtually no competition."(3)

Within this policy the Israeli authorities have carried out an entire range of measures aimed at the economic suffocation of the captured territories. Here are just some basic steps undertaken by the occupation administration.

1. The freezing of land reclamation projects and the prohibiting of the replacement of depleted water sources. For example, in the southern part of the Jordan Valley a majority of the natural springs has dried up since the subsoil waters have been captured by a system of artesian wells of the Jewish settlers. This measure alone was enough to almost completely eliminate Palestinian farming in this area.(4)

2. The introduction of water control for the Arab farms. A Palestinian has the right to use not more than 900 m³ of water per year for irrigation and this deprives him of the opportunity to increase the arable land. No such limits exist for the Jewish farms in the colonial settlements.(5)

3. A limitation on the possibilities of exporting agricultural products. Ordinarily the Palestinian peasants receive permission to sell their products in Israel within a month. However, in 1984, for example, when record crops were obtained in Israel and the occupied territories, the military administration shortened this period to one week(1). At the same time, the volume of Palestinian agricultural products permitted for export abroad, including to the Arab countries, was reduced by 40 percent.(6)

4. A restricting of the size of the planted area and the time of farm work. On the basis of the orders of the military administration No 1015 and No 1039 of 1983, each Arab peasant is obliged to receive a special license from an official of the occupation administration for carrying out field work indicating the amount of land permitted for farming and the sizes of the plots for each crop.(7)

5. Prohibiting the construction of new industrial enterprises and the expansion of existing ones. By the end of 1984, on the Left Bank there were only nine industrial enterprises (not counting the enterprises in the Jewish settlements). Since the start of the occupation not a single permission has been issued to create new jobs in industry. A number of factories and plants the products of which could compete with the Israeli has been closed down under various pretexts.(8)

6. Closing off the channels for financing economic development in the occupied territories. From 1977 through 1983, for example, various charitable organizations collected 66 million dollars for development projects on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. One-half of this money has been frozen in Israeli banks upon the orders of the occupation authorities.(9)

These measures by the Zionist leadership -- as well as a whole series of other steps in this direction -- naturally have led to a situation where mass unemployment has arisen in the occupied territories. As a consequence of this, even at the start of the 1970's, mass employment of the Arab labor force began in all sectors of the Israeli economy. "This is purely colonial exploitation of the workers who are deprived of civil and social rights and are completely at the mercy of the hirers," writes U. Avneri. "...The residents of Gaza and Nablus have begun to work on the fields of the kibbutzim and moshavs, in building villas in the fashionable districts of Tel Aviv and at the docks of Haifa. All the noble discussions of "Jewish labor" and "labor morality" have been ground into dust before the new idea, the idea of exploiting the labor of the population from the occupied territories.

At present, Israel employs, according to official data, 78,000 Palestinians (36 percent of all the manpower in the occupied territories), including 34 percent in construction, 13 percent in agriculture and 7.5 percent in the service sphere.(10) These workers are deprived of a large portion of the social rights: the right to a pension, for disability aid and for unemployment assistance. Here, in accord with the law adopted in 1970, the entrepreneur deducts a certain portion of their earnings into the national insurance system, this money is used as income for the state and goes for "development projects in the occupied territories," that is, primarily for the building of colonial settlements.

To the registered 78,000 Palestinians working under contract in Israel one must add approximately another 25,000-30,000 "illegal workers," one-half of whom are children. These basically are day-workers in agriculture. Each morning they assemble near the bus stations of the Israeli towns at illegal labor markets which in Israel are called "slave markets" and wait for hirers. The situation of the "illegal workers" is even worse than the officially registered ones. They are not covered by the minimum wage and work length law and for exhausting labor for 10-12 hours they receive not more than 3 or 4 dollars.

Again the "Seizing of Land"

"What is now happening on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is creeping annexation. The Israeli authorities are consistently driving the Arabs off

the land which they own and which they worked long before Jewish settlers appeared in Palestine.... This is larceny under the cover of the laws." This is how the situation on the occupied Palestinian territories has been described by a prominent Israeli sociologist and leading specialist in the area of Israeli colonial policy, Dr Meron Benvenishti.

The "seizing of land" was, as is known, one of the main tasks of Zionist colonization in Palestine since its very start. Only the methods now are not those which were used prior to the founding of the state of Israel or during the 1948 war. At present, the actions of the Zionist authorities can most precisely be described as "illegality with the aid of the laws."

And in actuality what laws are not employed on the occupied territories including the decrees of the military administration and the Jordanian legal enactments as well as Egyptian and Turkish, from the times of the Ottoman Empire and even decisions of the International Court! However, with all the great diversity of the legal measures, the aim and results of them are always the same: to erect an impenetrable wall between the Arabs and the land, to turn over as much land as possible to the Israeli institutions, organizations and private individuals and at the same time restrict the opportunities of the local population to use those plots which remain at its disposal.

The confiscation of Palestinian lands on the occupied territories started virtually immediately after the 1967 aggression. According to the Order "On Abandoned Property" (No 58 of 1967), any property the owner or legal holder of which left the Israeli-controlled territory without compensation for value was at the disposal of the "state agent for the management of abandoned property." One other order (No 150 of the same year) stated, in particular, that the property of organizations "managed from countries with which Israel is in a state of war" can also be confiscated without any indemnity. Equally confiscated was property of persons who were in "hostile states," that is, in Arab countries. Under these two enactments alone, the Zionist authorities appropriated 430,000 dunams of land on the Left Bank alone.

The so-called "state lands" were fully expropriated by the occupation authorities. At the end of the 1960's, the Israeli administration took over 530,000 dunams which were entered in the Jordanian cadaster records as "crown lands." In the following decade, by different legal tricks another nearly 160,000 dunams which were previously in private hands were declared to be "state lands." Here, as a rule, it was a question of plots the owners of which could not provide documents showing right of ownership. Considering how many such documents had been lost, destroyed or simply worn out over the last 60-80 years (and the occupation authorities do not replace such papers and do not issue duplicates), it cannot be doubted that the 160,000 dunams are far from the limit.

In 1980, the Israeli government (then headed by M. Begin, the author of the well-known plan for "administrative autonomy" which envisaged the perpetuating of Israeli control over the occupied territories) worked out a new tactic of confiscation in comparison with which all that the occupiers had done before dims. Fetched out was an Ottoman law of 1855(1) which stated literally the following: "Lands not registered in the cadaster in someone's name, not

assigned to a village or town or which are a distance away from whence the human voice cannot be heard...are 'dead.' Each person who so desires can work these lands with the permission of a representative of the authorities gratis under the condition that ownership of these lands is in the hands of the sultan." The Zionist authorities gave this law the following, to put it mildly, "free" interpretation: all unworked lands on the occupied territories not entered in the cadaster are state property and only the occupation administration has the right to dispose of them. Thus, the newly appeared "heirs of the sultan" in a single sweep confiscated 40 percent of the land(11) on the occupied territories!

At the same time, one other method was thought up to rob the Palestinians on "legal" bases. This time a pretext was found in a Jordanian law of 1943 which envisaged the possibility of confiscating land for social needs such as road construction, for administrative buildings and so forth. The occupation authorities actually built roads on the thus confiscated lands only these roads lead to the colonial settlements, bypassing the Arab towns and villages. And the administrative buildings built are chiefly prisons.

One other widely practiced method of confiscating private land holdings is the establishing of "closed areas." By the spring of 1985, on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip 24 closed areas were established and access to these was prohibited to the Arabs "out of security considerations." The total area of these regions is 1.1 million dunams. A large portion of the land in the "closed areas" has ultimately been turned over to the Jewish rightist extremist organizations for building colonial settlements. And in order to get around the ruling of the World Court in the Hague which prohibits such expropriation except for military requirements, the Israeli Supreme Court has declared the settlements "a part of the regional defense system serving military aims."

Finally, if "legal" forms of larceny do not work, then "cloak and dagger" methods are put to use. During the period of the rule of Likud, the Zionist authorities created a real "land Mafia" from members of the rightist extremist organizations. Their activities can be judged from a report of the investigative administration of the Israeli police published in January 1984. The police headquarters, the report states, have accumulated hundreds of statements from Arabs who have been threatened with injury by armed groups consisting of settlers, real estate agents and inveterate criminals. Against the Palestinians a campaign of intimidation and terror has been waged using the methods of the "Wild West": criminals set afire the ripening fields and farm structures, they damage the citrus groves and break the water supply pipes. Many Arabs have been beaten up because they do not want to sell their land to the contractors building the settlements.

If the Palestinian peasants cannot be frightened the "land Mafia" uses other methods. One of these has been described in the magazine AOLAM AZE of 21 July 1978. "...A Jewish broker proposes a plot to the state (as a rule, land not yet purchased and belonging to an Arab). A contract is concluded and the state pays a deposit. Several months later the 'broker' states that the deal has not gone through, as they have changed their mind about selling the land. He is ready to return the deposit and pay the stipulated 4 percent for the

cancellation of the deal. The 'broker' has gained in any event as he has already invested the deposit received and earned a good interest. But the state suffers a loss: with the existing rate of inflation the total deposit is completely without value. And the occupation regime begins pressuring the landowner. As a rule, the question ends with a forced 'sale' and not merely confiscation."

The result of the Zionist practice of "seizing land" is: in just 7 years of Likud rule, 90 colonial settlements were established on the West Bank and 44 in the Gaza Strip with a total population of 50,000 persons.(12) The Israeli authorities in one form or another have seized over one-half of all the land in the occupied territories.(13)

"Ship the Arabs to Arabia!..."

At a warehouse at the colonial settlement of Ofra on the West Bank there are scores of wooden cedar beams. They belong to a certain Euda Etzion, one of the leaders of the Jewish terroristic underground on the occupied territories. The settlers assert that these are beams from the Temple of Solomon (in fact, they have been stolen from the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem after the attempt to set it afire at the end of the 1960's). The day will come, the settlers say, and we will resurrect the Temple in Jerusalem on the ruins of the Omar and Al-Aqsa Mosques.

And until this day comes, the rightist extremist organizations of the "Judeo-Nazis"(14) have initiated a campaign in the aim of "purging" Jerusalem of Palestinians. The extremists are active chiefly in the former Jewish quarter of the Old City (as a result of the division of Jerusalem in 1949, this district which comprised a significant portion of East Jerusalem was turned over to Jordan) and forcefully expel people from their own homes, stating that prior to 1948 these houses belonged to Jews.

The Zionist extremists have made no secret of their main goal: expelling the Arabs from the entire territory of Palestine and creating an "indivisible Erets Israel." Here is what was written by one of the ideologists of the extreme right, David Rosenzweig, in the printed organ of the settlement organizations NKUDA (No 67): "The Arabs should feel that the land is literally slipping from under their feet.... The government must organize and

carry out an action of the mass resettlement of the Arabs." Echoing him is another activist in the settlement organizations, Rabbi Eli Sadan who has urged "using the proper moment to deport the Arabs to Arabia" (NKUDA, No 4).(15)

The "Judeo-Nazis" have wagered primarily on terror against the Palestinians. "The children are beaten until their flesh is rended from their bones and dogs are sent against the Arabs," stated the Israeli sociologist, Prof Michael Bruno.(16)

Particular renown has been gained by a band of settlers known in the Israeli press as the "Jewish underground." The members of the "underground" have made attempts on the lives of the mayors of the Palestinian cities in 1980 and they

carried out a bloody pogrom in the Islamic College in Hebron; they have thrown bombs into mosques on the West Bank and at busses carrying Palestinians. In the course of the trial of the terrorists it was shown that the "Jewish underground" was controlled by the leadership of the settler religious-fascist organization Gush Emunim and certain members of the Knesset from the rightist parties were in on its activities.

In addition to the "Jewish underground," the Zionist extremists have also set up a whole series of terrorist groups which operate against the Palestinians. Among these are the following: the Council for Security on the Roads of Judea and Samara established in 1979 and which is directly under the central organs of the settlement self-administration and receives weapons from the army dumps upon orders of the former chief of the Israeli Army General Staff R. Eytan; "Terror Against Terror" (TNT) which has operated since 1975 and consists of members from the fascist Kakh Party; TNT -- Tel Aviv" headed by the inveterate criminal and agent of the Israeli Security Service Iosef Aniv; Hasmonai which was established at the beginning of the 1980's by members of the youth organization of the religious-Zionist Mafdal Party; Maccabees, Bnei Zion, Egrofagen and others.

Even from this brief list one can see that the "Judeo-Nazis" are not "marginal elements" in Israeli society, as Israeli propaganda has endeavored to depict things, but rather closely tied to the Zionist establishment. In essence, they have become its terrorist wing taking on the "dirty work" on the occupied territories within the official policy of robbing the Palestinians. With good reason even the former chief of the Shin Beth Security Service, Gen Avraam Ahituv, was forced to admit that "the policy of 'assimilating' the Arab lands has served...as grounds on which Jewish terrorism has grown up."(17)

What Next?

The policy of "grand larceny of the Palestinians" which has continued since the end of the last century up to the present unambiguously shows the always-present imperialist and colonialist essence of Zionism. For more than 80 years now the Zionist leadership has carried out a consistent policy of depriving the Palestinians of their national rights, a policy of expulsion and colonial exploitation. As was pointed out in the resolutions of the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel, the ruling circles of Israel "intend to annex all Palestinian territory, expel the Palestinian people from their homeland and even eliminate their national existence.... These intrigues are aimed against the entire Palestinian people, including that portion which lives in Israel. They intend to expel the predominant majority of the Palestinian people both from the territories occupied by Israel in 1967 as well as from Israel itself."

But even the cruelest methods of suppression and terror have not been capable of breaking the spirit of the Palestinians or shaking their desire for equality, for national liberation and the establishing of their own state. In Israel and in the occupied territories there is a widening movement of the Arab community against the expansionist course of the Zionist leaders. In this struggle the Palestinians are relying upon support from the democratic circles in the Jewish community of Israel, on the aid of the antiimperialist

Arab regimes and on the militant solidarity of the international progressive community headed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist commonwealth countries.

Undoubtedly, one must not underestimate the danger of the rapacious plans of the Zionist elite. As is known, in particular, the Shnut leadership and the leaders of the rightist extremists in Israel have worked out a program for moving a million Jewish settlers into the occupied territories by the year 2010. The most fanatic Zionist groupings have introduced a draft law in the Knesset which in no way differs from the Nazi "Nuremberg Laws" and envisage the complete deprivation of any rights whatsoever for the Arabs in Israel and on the captured lands. For example, the fuhrer of the Israeli fascists, Rabbi Kahane, from the rostrum of the Knesset has demanded the expulsion of all Arabs beyond the Jordan, with the exception of only those who "will pay a special tax and assume all the obligations of slaves." (18)

However, the times of successful colonial adventures are over once and for all. On the world scene there is a clear prevailing of the forces of national liberation and social progress. There can be no doubt that the Zionist plans of perpetuating the "grand larceny of the Palestinians" are ultimately doomed to failure.

FOOTNOTES

1. SHVUON HAARETS, 1 June 1984, p 11.
2. AOLAM AZE, 1980, No 2209, p 4.
3. HAARETS, 12 October 1984.
4. AL FAJR (Jerusalem), 26 October 1984.
5. KOL ISRAEL, 19 November 1984.
6. AL FAJR (Jerusalem), 26 October 1984.
7. KOL ISRAEL, 5 March 1984.
8. DAVAR, 14 November 1984.
9. KOL ISRAEL, 9 April 1984.
10. DUAH ALISHKA AMERIKAZIT LISTATISTIKA, March 1984.
11. AL GAMISHMAR, 26 April 1985.
12. SOHNUT REPORT, 1 November 1984.
13. HAARETS, 11 April 1985.
14. The term was introduced by the Israeli scholar, Prof Ieshiagu Leibowitz.

15. Quoted in AOLAM AZE, No 2425, 1984.

16. AL GAMISHMAR, 6 November 1984.

17. DAVAR, 19 August 1983.

18. HAARETS, 31 May 1985.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya". 1985

Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

10272

CS0: 1807/036

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

SOVIET FOREIGN TRADE STATISTICS: JANUARY-JUNE 1985

Moscow FOREIGN TRADE in English No 9, Sep 85 not paginated (annex)

[Text] Soviet Foreign Trade by Groups of Countries
(min rubles)

		January — June	
		1984	1985
TOTAL	Turnover	69081,6	70430,2
	Export	35911,8	34200,2
	Import	33169,8	36230,0
Socialist countries	Turnover	40728,2	43160,0
	Export	20949,5	21548,2
	Import	19778,7	21611,8
including:			
CMEA member countries	Turnover	37308,7	39033,6
	Export	19238,0	19520,1
	Import	18070,7	19513,5
Industrial capitalist countries	Turnover	19972,1	18973,5
	Export	10293,2	8266,8
	Import	9678,9	10706,7
Developing countries	Turnover	8381,3	8296,7
	Export	4669,1	4385,2
	Import	3712,2	3911,5

Soviet Foreign Trade by Countries*
(in rubles)

Countries		January — June	
		1984	1985
EUROPE:			
Austria	Turnover	862,1	772,6
	Export	381,2	370,0
	Import	480,9	402,6
Belgium	Turnover	848,2	681,1
	Export	577,0	383,8
	Import	271,2	297,3
Bulgaria	Turnover	5996,9	6067,9
	Export	3174,1	3156,0
	Import	2822,8	2911,9
Great Britain	Turnover	1086,4	940,8
	Export	691,0	549,2
	Import	395,4	391,6
Hungary	Turnover	4308,1	4486,6
	Export	2266,3	2206,8
	Import	2041,8	2279,8
German Democratic Republic	Turnover	7354,2	7531,6
	Export	3582,7	3710,4
	Import	3771,5	3821,2
Greece	Turnover	287,8	307,5
	Export	224,0	238,1
	Import	63,8	69,4
Denmark	Turnover	204,3	182,9
	Export	153,4	131,9
	Import	50,9	51,0
West Berlin	Turnover	211,1	180,6
	Export	166,2	114,1
	Import	44,9	66,5
Ireland	Turnover	36,8	31,0
	Export	14,9	11,5
	Import	21,9	19,5
Iceland	Turnover	61,3	59,8
	Export	24,5	23,6
	Import	36,8	36,2

*The countries are given in the Russian alphabetical order.

Spain	Turnover	314,4	298,8
	Export	162,8	101,6
	Import	151,6	197,2
Italy	Turnover	2182,2	1677,1
	Export	1503,3	1018,5
	Import	678,9	658,6
Liechtenstein	Turnover	16,7	4,7
	Export	0,8	0,6
	Import	15,9	4,1
Luxembourg	Turnover	7,2	12,1
	Export	2,4	4,6
	Import	4,8	7,5
Malta	Turnover	5,4	9,2
	Export	1,0	1,8
	Import	4,4	7,4
Netherlands	Turnover	858,8	560,6
	Export	726,6	402,3
	Import	132,2	158,3
Norway	Turnover	95,3	95,0
	Export	49,5	56,2
	Import	45,8	38,8
Poland	Turnover	5510,2	5700,3
	Export	2916,4	3089,3
	Import	2593,8	2611,0
Portugal	Turnover	43,9	74,0
	Export	26,4	32,5
	Import	17,5	41,5
Romania	Turnover	1894,9	1971,1
	Export	952,4	888,5
	Import	942,5	1082,6
Federal Republic of Germany	Turnover	3828,8	3363,3
	Export	2148,1	1749,4
	Import	1680,7	1613,9
Finland	Turnover	2463,1	2355,7
	Export	1156,7	1046,9
	Import	1306,4	1308,8
France	Turnover	2144,6	1995,2
	Export	1237,7	989,5
	Import	906,9	1005,7
Czechoslovakia	Turnover	6342,1	6562,3
	Export	3346,2	3316,8
	Import	2995,9	3245,5

Switzerland	Turnover	383,4	464,3
	Export	187,3	181,7
	Import	196,1	282,6
Sweden	Turnover	424,5	412,7
	Export	292,8	235,3
	Import	131,7	177,4
Yugoslavia	Turnover	2655,2	3006,7
	Export	1342,7	1387,5
	Import	1312,5	1619,2

ASIA:

Afghanistan	Turnover	511,0	477,0
	Export	347,0	309,1
	Import	164,0	167,9
Bangladesh	Turnover	19,2	30,7
	Export	16,6	14,0
	Import	2,6	16,7
Burma	Turnover	1,3	0,4
	Export	1,0	0
	Import	0,3	0,4
Vietnam	Turnover	650,9	724,3
	Export	528,6	599,3
	Import	122,3	125,0
India	Turnover	1140,2	1432,7
	Export	636,3	736,6
	Import	503,9	696,1
Indonesia	Turnover	21,1	50,9
	Export	2,1	2,9
	Import	19,0	48,0
Jordan	Turnover	10,5	5,3
	Export	10,4	5,3
	Import	0,1	0
Iraq	Turnover	465,8	388,7
	Export	105,2	121,1
	Import	360,6	267,6
Iran	Turnover	134,4	184,7
	Export	119,6	103,8
	Import	14,8	80,9

Yemen Arab Republic	Turnover	5,3	7,3
	Export	5,3	7,3
	Import	0	0
People's Democratic Republic of Yemen	Turnover	56,8	85,9
	Export	54,4	81,4
	Import	2,4	4,5
Kampuchea	Turnover	37,6	41,9
	Export	35,1	38,7
	Import	2,5	3,2
Cyprus	Turnover	22,5	8,0
	Export	14,5	2,2
	Import	8,0	5,8
China	Turnover	394,4	599,0
	Export	172,0	307,1
	Import	222,4	291,9
Korean People's Democratic Republic	Turnover	337,2	464,1
	Export	164,6	278,5
	Import	172,6	185,6
Kuwait	Turnover	2,3	2,1
	Export	2,0	1,9
	Import	0,3	0,2
Laos	Turnover	32,7	56,6
	Export	32,2	55,0
	Import	0,5	1,6
Lebanon	Turnover	21,4	11,9
	Export	19,0	7,2
	Import	2,4	4,7
Malaysia	Turnover	133,1	103,5
	Export	7,5	6,8
	Import	125,6	96,7
Mongolian People's Republic	Turnover	678,7	727,8
	Export	546,3	585,1
	Import	132,4	142,7
Nepal	Turnover	9,6	13,7
	Export	8,3	11,4
	Import	1,3	2,3
Pakistan	Turnover	68,0	51,4
	Export	45,8	23,1
	Import	22,2	28,3
Saudi Arabia	Turnover	155,9	183,9
	Export	12,6	9,4
	Import	143,3	174,5
Singapore	Turnover	145,9	38,9
	Export	7,8	3,0
	Import	138,1	35,9

Syria	Turnover	256.0	236.8
	Export	128.7	158.7
	Import	127.3	78.1
Thailand	Turnover	19.5	44.5
	Export	5.6	7.2
	Import	13.9	37.3
Turkey	Turnover	100.4	141.5
	Export	61.2	68.7
	Import	39.2	72.8
Philippines	Turnover	23.8	18.5
	Export	4.0	2.2
	Import	19.8	16.3
Sri Lanka	Turnover	35.4	26.2
	Export	1.0	4.0
	Import	34.4	22.2
Japan	Turnover	1444.4	1700.1
	Export	408.7	455.6
	Import	1035.7	1244.5
AFRICA:			
Algeria	Turnover	75.4	175.5
	Export	66.3	61.5
	Import	9.1	114.0
Angola	Turnover	40.0	37.1
	Export	38.6	35.9
	Import	1.4	1.2
Ivory Coast	Turnover	94.1	80.2
	Export	0.9	2.2
	Import	93.2	78.0
Ghana	Turnover	16.4	31.1
	Export	0.5	0.2
	Import	15.9	30.9
Guinea	Turnover	43.4	45.8
	Export	16.4	21.7
	Import	27.0	24.1
Egypt	Turnover	249.4	272.8
	Export	112.4	120.0
	Import	137.0	152.8
Cameroun	Turnover	9.4	27.0
	Export	2.1	3.1
	Import	7.3	23.9

People's Republic of the Congo	Turnover Export Import	2,6 2,1 0,5	3,7 2,5 1,2
Libya	Turnover Export Import	508,5 40,6 467,9	515,8 56,0 459,8
Morocco	Turnover Export Import	75,9 39,5 36,4	74,0 27,7 46,3
Mozambique	Turnover Export Import	95,2 94,2 1,0	50,2 49,8 0,4
Nigeria	Turnover Export Import	143,4 107,7 35,7	77,2 60,1 17,1
Sudan	Turnover Export Import	3,5 0 3,5	6,5 2,1 4,4
Sierra Leone	Turnover Export Import	0,6 0 0,6	10,7 0,1 10,6
Tanzania	Turnover Export Import	4,4 2,4 2,0	3,3 1,8 1,5
Tunisia	Turnover Export Import	18,5 16,4 2,1	6,4 4,7 1,7
Ethiopia	Turnover Export Import	95,2 81,0 14,2	167,8 155,3 12,5
AMERICAS:			
Argentina	Turnover Export Import	741,4 14,2 727,2	792,4 23,0 769,4
Bolivia	Turnover Export Import	2,7 0,7 2,0	0,4 0,2 0,2
Brazil	Turnover Export Import	296,6 68,3 228,3	196,0 27,2 168,8
Canada	Turnover Export Import	396,8 8,5 388,3	416,5 8,2 408,3

Colombia	Turnover	21,5	6,8
	Export	2,0	2,3
	Import	19,5	4,5
Cuba	Turnover	4572,7	5261,7
	Export	1925,0	1967,9
	Import	2647,7	3293,8
Mexico	Turnover	11,8	11,1
	Export	0,7	4,0
	Import	11,1	7,1
Nicaragua	Turnover	49,7	107,1
	Export	49,3	107,0
	Import	0,4	0,1
Panama	Turnover	5,2	5,0
	Export	5,1	5,0
	Import	0,1	-
Peru	Turnover	16,7	39,7
	Export	8,1	4,5
	Import	8,6	35,2
United States of America	Turnover	1410,6	1910,6
	Export	138,6	147,1
	Import	1271,8	1763,5
Uruguay	Turnover	35,3	56,0
	Export	0,5	23,1
	Import	34,8	32,9
AUSTRALIA AND OCEANIA:			
Australia	Turnover	317,7	412,7
	Export	6,1	10,7
	Import	311,6	402,0
New Zealand	Turnover	34,3	53,0
	Export	3,0	2,1
	Import	31,3	50,9

COPYRIGHT: "Vneshnyaya trgovlya" 1985
English translation, "Foreign trade", 1985

/9274
CSO: 1812/36

TWO BOOKS ASSAILING U.S. MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX REVIEWED

Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNIKH SIL in Russian No 13, Jul 85 pp 89-92

[Review by S. Zabolotskikh, cand. econ. sci., under the heading: "A Criminal Business" of books "Krovavyy biznes" [A Bloody Business] by collective authorship, edited by G.N. Tsagolov, Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 351 pages; and, "Mezhdunarodnyy voyenno-promyshlennyy biznes" [The International Military-Industrial Business] by A.V. Buzuyev, Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya [International Relations], Moscow, 1985, 200 pages]

[Text] Never before in the postwar period has the militarization of various aspects of life in the USA reached such a large scale as at present. As the citadel of imperialism and the center of modern militarism, the United States of America is making ever-increasing efforts in its attempts to halt the course of history, to turn back human development. In so doing it is directing the edge of its aggressive policy primarily against the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist commonwealth.

The books under review, recently released by the central publishing houses, are dedicated to exposing those forces which in the race for superprofits are supercharging a militaristic psychosis, and are pushing the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe. While differing in their style and format of presenting their materials, they complement one another well in exposing the criminal activity of the military-industrial business, which today is one of the principal motive forces of imperialism. The books contain quite a fund of ideology, and call one's attention to the class and party approach to analysis of the phenomena typical of contemporary imperialism.

The monograph under collective authorship points to the major magnates of the weapons industry business in America, and describes the allies of the mighty clan of military-industrial concerns in the political sphere, and in the US apparatus of state.

In our periodicals and our literature, research dedicated to illuminating the American military-industrial complex [MIC] has a special place. Nevertheless the authors' selection, which once again turns to displaying the cast of mind of those who currently head that small but extremely influential social group, who set the tone in the policies of the West and who cast a dark shadow over the general state of international life, is still very topical today. It is namely in the USA that the MIC, pretending to the role of the leader in the capitalist world, has found the greatest development.

It is namely the US military-industrial complex that reflects most vividly the typical features and directions of the development of the military-industrial complexes of the imperialist states.

Analyzing the position of the MIC in the state-monopolistic structure of contemporary imperialism, the authors of the book point to its special position. Military-industrial complexes function today as if they were at the meeting point of private monopolistic associations and the state. While remaining integral parts of this or that financial group, the weapons concerns now form a kind of state-monopolistic entity, in which the ties of the concerns with military institutions in the state apparatus have taken on no less importance than their ties with financial capital. The military-industrial complex, it is pointed out in the book, without disrupting the system of the financial-oligarchy groups which had previously been formed, now supplements the monopolistic organization of contemporary capitalism, which serves to reflect the tendency for the development of capitalism in a military-state-monopolistic direction.

The increasing role of the military-state bureaucracy in bourgeois society is hardly a new phenomenon. Citing the words of Lenin on the fact that monopolistic capitalism in accordance with its basic economic attributes is distinguished by the "greatest and universal development of the military clique," the authors of the monograph disclose the root causes of the advance to the proscenium of American political life in the 1970's and 1980's of the representatives of the country's western states--America's weapons "smithy."

Ronald Reagan's administration in the USA is not called the "California Mafia" for nothing. Dozens of leading positions at the upper levels of state power in Washington are occupied today by the creatures of the military monopolies from the states of Texas and Arizona, but most of all from California. A coincidence? Hardly. It is namely in California that almost one fourth of all orders from the Pentagon are placed, and more than half the state orders placed by NASA. In the 1982-85 fiscal year contracts were concluded with the concerns in that state in the amount of 35 billion dollars, for 25 of the USA's major military programs. Today over 90 percent of the regions' economic activity depends on military orders, and one-third of the enterprises of San Francisco and Los Angeles are connected with the arms race, as well as two-thirds of the jobs in the electronics industry in "Silicone Valley."

The reasons for this are found in the higher profitability of military production. The authors of the book illustrate this conclusion with the results of an investigation published by the main control and financial administration of the USA in the early 1980's. As analysis of 146 of the largest weapons contracts indicated, the average profit norm for capital invested in concerns carrying out these orders was four times higher than profit norms for that same period of 500 major corporations operating in the civilian market. It is namely the super-high profits which are the motive economic force for the arms race. But only the state can provide these superprofits to the monopolists.

Being at one and the same time the client and the purchaser of military production, the state offers the military industrialist a guaranteed sales market. Therefore, the corporations strive by all available means to organize close interrelationships with the parliaments and state organs. And, owing to "revolving doors" as they are called in the USA, personnel are exchanged among the military departments, the state apparatus and the monopolies; the corporations which have a material interest receive approval for appropriations for ever larger militaristic programs; they have the capability of determining the range of goods and the volume of military products manufactured; and, they establish the prices for them and regulate the demand.

The book presents clear evidence of the criminal entanglement of the weapons business with the military-state and political spheres in the USA. One of the symbols of such entanglements is the California aerospace concern, Northrop. During the 1970's, the authors stress, 343 former military and civilian officials from the Pentagon and 17 highly-placed employees of NASA joined the concern as managerial personnel. At the same time, 17 responsible officials from the firm moved into the offices of the military and space departments. More than half of Northrop's directors, including the chairman of the director's council, T. Johnson, formerly held prominent posts in a department of state or in US military departments.

In the years 1978-1980 Northrop financed the election campaigns of both California senators, 26 out of 43 members of the House of Representatives from this state, and over 100 other congressmen, including the majority of the members on the Armed Services Committee. At the same time the concern allocated funds for 8 presidential candidates, including Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan. Helping both Republicans and Democrats, it is noted in the book, Northrop was playing a game it could not lose. The firm's expenditures were well-compensated. It is no accident that Northrop won an extremely stubborn battle with its competitors for orders for the creation of the "invisible" aircraft, Stealth--which is the future primary US strategic bomber. If, as it is proposed, Stealth is put into serial production, this will bring the firm orders for a minimum of 30 billion dollars and will permit it to occupy the position of the Pentagon's main supplier.

Lockheed and Boeing, Rockwell International and Bechtel, General Dynamics and Interarms... The reader passes through a gallery of large-scale portraits of the masters of the main California monopolies which work for war. The book discloses the mechanism of the interaction of the military-industrial corporations, the militarist leadership clique and US figures of state, which permit the Pentagon to extort from the treasury three-quarters of a billion dollars every day. No special secrets exist on how "effectively" this "mechanism" operates, inasmuch as, as everyone knows, in addition to the President, the direct allies of the military monopolies in the US Government are Secretary of State George Shultz, Defense Secretary Caspar Wineberger, CIA Director William Casey, and other highly-placed officials.

The book convincingly exposes, in complete detail, the methods by which the weapons octopi of America dip their tentacles into the state treasury. Describing the Washington scenarios according to which the performances are staged in the country for supercharging the militaristic psychosis, the authors illustrate the procedure for drawing up the American military budget, which organically gravitates, in the words of one of Ronald Reagan's aides, toward "wastefulness and deceit, brought about by political considerations and abuse."

It is precisely the direct deception of the American taxpayers, and constantly frightening them with an imaginary Soviet threat, that led to the fact that in comparison with 1980, US expenditures for basic military programs increased twofold in 1985, and in certain cases fourfold. On the whole, during the present five-year period the gigantic figure of one trillion dollars has already been entered in the Pentagon's price list.

Reflecting on the conditions and consequences of the rise of military-industrial complexes in the world of capital, the authors of the book "Krovavyy biznes" [Bloody Business] stress the special danger of this phenomenon, pointing to the programmed nature of the entire character of the capitalist system. The special aggressiveness of imperialism begets the "needs" of the monopolistic bourgeoisie, for whom armed force is a means both for the defense of their social milieu, and for achieving their global hegemonistic ends.

It was precisely this that led to the fact that the importance of national military-industrial complexes has increased so radically in the system of economic and political relations among the imperialist countries in recent years. Capitalist reality confirms even more forcefully than before the correctness of Lenin's thesis on the fact that "International-intermeshed capital makes magnificent deals for weapons and war" (V.I. Lenin, Complete Collection of Works, Vol 26, p 232).

How do the "merchants of death" conduct their foreign business? How do they establish and maintain contacts among themselves? What are the peculiar features of their penetration into the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America? A. Buzuyev, in his book "Mezhdunarodnyy voyennopromyshlennyy biznes" [The International Military-Industrial Business], has undertaken a successful attempt to find the answers to these and other questions.

Pointing to the vividly-expressed international character of contemporary militarism, the author stresses that the basis for the process of intensification of economic contacts and ties of the national MIC lies primarily in the activity of international monopolies. The most widespread variety of contemporary international monopolies are the transnational corporations (TNC), which have at the present time become one of the principal motive forces of militarism. The growth of the number of joint military programs implemented by them, agreements concluded on specialization, cooperation and exchange of results of scientific research and experimental design work in the military sphere, along with the radical increase in the volume of arms trade, leads to the establishment of an international

economic base for the aggregate military-industrial complex of imperialism, which is vitally interested in increasing the arms race, and in preparing for armed confrontations with the socialist states.

The book presents convincing proof of the close ties of American and European TNC's with the most reactionary force of modern times--the financial oligarchy. The facts and arguments employed by the author permit illustrating in bold detail the mechanism of the subordination of the major military-industrial concerns of the USA, the FRG, Great Britain, and other NATO countries to the powerful financial groups of the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Mellons, the Thissens, and the like, which simultaneously control the major portion of the modern TNC's of various types. It is namely through the "financial empires," it is noted in the monograph, that continuous contacts are maintained between manufacturers of complex combat equipment and weapons and a great number of TNC's, which supply raw materials, equipment, and separate components for military production. It is namely such "unity" of the military-industrial concerns and TNC's, realized through the financial groups, that today represents the main economic basis of modern militarism.

In his chapter dedicated to arms exports through TNC channels, the author presents factual materials which permit one to make a judgement on the "style" and "methods" of the activity of the monopolies in the sale of military equipment abroad. The corporations which manufacture arms are not fastidious about their means. In the 1970's alone American and European concerns which manufacture aerial rockets paid out hundreds of millions of dollars in the form of bribes and other illegal payments to political parties and to certain people, for help in promoting their products. Military aircraft of the Lockheed aerospace concern, for example, were sold with the aid of bribes to Japan, Italy, Canada, Greece, the FRG and other countries. The practice of bribery, as was shown in A. Buzuyev's monograph, is widely utilized by military industrialists of Western Europe as well.

In the concluding chapters of the books under review, the authors offer convincing proof against a wide background of contemporary international events, what a sinister role the military-industrial corporations play in implementing the strategic plans and doctrines of imperialism. Comprising the nucleus of the military-industrial complexes of the leading imperialist powers, it is precisely they who display special zeal for stepping up the arms race, in strengthening the military-political blocs, in increasing the dependence of a number of newly-liberated states on their former mother countries. Earning their thirty pieces of silver from the military corporations, the ruling circles of the NATO countries are making decisions on the growth of military expenditures, and are sanctioning the development of new kinds of weapons. To a significant extent the result of the clandestine activities of the military-industrial monopolies, many peaceful initiatives of the socialist states were spoiled--such as the ratification of SALT II, and the Geneva negotiations on medium-range missiles. Owing to a significant degree to their pressure, new American nuclear missile weapons systems have been deployed in Western Europe, and a program to prepare for "Star Wars" has been worked out and is already being implemented.

The Soviet Union, loyal to the principles of peaceful coexistence, is stolidly fighting to strengthen the peace, and for universal and complete disarmament, which would guarantee equal security to both sides. Designs to achieve military superiority over the USSR are futile. Our people have fully mastered the lessons of history and, therefore--as was noted in the report at the celebration ceremonies dedicated to the 40th Anniversary of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War--we will not permit the military-strategic parity of the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, to be destroyed.

The editions just reviewed will no doubt be of interest to the military reader. By their entire content they help more profoundly explain the political and economic sources observed in the world of capitalism for the rise of the military-industrial complexes; to more completely understand the causes and consequences of the domination of their "illitimate power" in the politics and economy of the capitalist states. Commanders, political workers, and propagandists will find in these books useful material for their everyday work in exposing those imperialist circles which are presently pushing the world toward the depths of a nuclear missile war.

COPYRIGHT: "Kommunist vooruzhennykh Sil", 1985.

9006

CSO: 1807/031

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

BRIEFS

PIERRE TRUDEAU IN BAKU--Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 10 Jul 85 carries on page 1 a 300-word Azerinform report on Pierre Trudeau's visit to Baku. In addition to acquainting himself with Azerbaijani economic achievements, especially in the oil industry, "P. E. Trudeau was at the Spiritual Administration for the Muslims of the Transcaucasus where he spoke to Sheykhul-Islam A.H. Pashazade and visited the Taze Pir mosque". While in Baku, he was accompanied by G.A. Arbatov, director of the USA and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and N.A. Akhundov of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the AzSSR Supreme Soviet. [Editorial Report]

U.S. PEACE DELEGATES IN TBILISI--Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 29 Sep 85 carries on page 3 a 300-word item about a group of peace supporters from the United States visiting Tbilisi at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. The group consists of religious and educational figures--members of the American organization "Bridges to Peace". On 28 September they were received by the secretary of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Georgian SSR T. Lashkarashvili. The group, led by D. Smith, also met with A. Aleksidze, chairman of the Georgian Republic Committee for the Defense of Peace, and with the Catholic Patriarch of Georgia Ilya II. [Editorial Report]

CSO: 1807/116-P

WESTERN EUROPE

UNPRECEDENTED FOREIGN POLICY DIFFERENCES CAUSE ITALIAN CRISIS

Considerable Stress in Various Circles

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 85 p 4

[Article by M. Ilinskiy: "Italy: Around the Government Crisis"]

[Text] Rome (special IZVESTIYA correspondent). "The Most Serious Crisis," "Infringement on Italy's Sovereignty Disclosed," "Serious Difficulties in Prospect".... Such headings which characterize the situation in the country are placed on the front pages of Rome newspapers. Numerous articles, reports, and accounts call to mind the chronicle of events of the last 10 days which preceded the forty-fourth government crisis by count during Italy's postwar history.

On Friday, 18 October, the president began urgent political consultations with former presidents of the republic, former chairmen of the Council of Ministers, present-day chairmen of the senate and the chamber of deputies, and with the leaders of all leading political parties of the ruling majority and the opposition. Having concluded these consultations, he charged one of the political figures with the formation of a new government. And only then will it be considered that the head of state formally accepted the resignation of the cabinet of B. Craxi who, up to that moment, as formerly remains responsible for the government's accomplishment of current tasks.

In analyzing the situation which has been created, observers note that its special feature, in contrast with preceding government crises, as the newspaper REPUBBLICA considers, is that the crisis arose due to disagreements in the government coalition on questions in the sphere of foreign policy for the first time in Italy's entire postwar history.

How did this happen? On 16 October the political secretary of the Italian Republican Party who is also the defense minister in the coalition cabinet, Giovanni Spadolini, announced the adoption of a decision to leave the government by the leadership of the IRP. What caused this decision by the IRP? This step was taken due to the Republicans' dissent with the government's actions in the course of events connected with the seizure of the Italian diesel ship "Achille Lauro."

The Republicans' dissatisfaction, as follows from the Italian press, was caused by the government's decision not to detain one of the leaders of the Palestine

Liberation Front, Abul Abbas. (He was on board the Egyptian civilian airplane which was intercepted by American fighter planes and forced by them to land on the island of Sicily.)

The Italian government let Abul Abbas leave the country freely. In this regard, as Italian newspapers report, the government informed Defense Minister Spadolini of this action on Saturday, 12 October. Thus, the government observed legal regulations. But the IRP believes that the government acted incorrectly and allegedly should have turned Abul Abbas over to the United States.

The leadership of the IRP, journalists here note, speaks out from pro-American positions, and as regards the Near East problem, is striving for the strengthening of ties with Israel.

The present government crisis in Italy is causing well-founded alarm and considerable tension in various circles of the country. The newspaper REPUBBLICA provides a broad range of evaluations by representatives of trade unions as well as of other circles concerning the situation which has developed in the country. The sense of these evaluations is that those forces which led to the government crisis are condemned in them.

Crisis Provoked by U.S.

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Oct 85 p 5

[Article by V. Solomin: "Was the Crisis Provoked?"]

[Text] The spacious hall of the Palazzo Chigi, the residence of the head of the Italian government--which was allocated for the press conference of the chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, B. Craxi, and the Prime Minister of Tunisia, M. Mzaly, who was in Rome on an official visit--was filled to overflowing, and more and more journalists continued to arrive. A line to obtain special passes was formed in the narrow passageway where you land, passing an "electronic horseshoe" like those which have been installed at the airports of the entire world. Such increased interest displayed by the press, radio, and television of Italy and of many other countries in the press conference was completely understandable and explainable. The ruins of houses barbarously destroyed by Israeli fighter-bombers still piled up in the environs of the capital of Tunisia. And Italy still could not get over the shock caused by the seizure of the diesel ship "Achille Lauro" in the Mediterranean Sea by a group of terrorists and the scandalous piratical actions of the American militarists which followed right after this.

"The development of the situation in the Near East, which is characterized by an increase in tension, causes our serious concern. We declare our solidarity with Tunisia--a peaceful country which was subjected to aggression condemned by the Italian government. In turn, Tunisia condemned the seizure of the 'Achille Lauro' and assisted us in liberating the passengers of the diesel ship." The voice of B. Craxi sounded firm and confident....

But prior to the press conference itself the national leadership of the IPR--the Italian Republican Party--announced withdrawal from the ruling five-party coalition and the recall of three of its ministers from the government. A political crisis was begun in the country.

The governmental crisis which broke out in Italy is the forty-fourth of the post-war period. The present cabinet lacked only one month to repeat the absolute record for stay in power in republican Italy which was established by the third government of Aldo Moro which "held out" for 834 days. A special feature of this crisis is that it arose beyond the walls of the Italian parliament, and the stumbling block was not questions of domestic policy, as was usual, but of foreign policy--Italy's relationship with the United States, its main partner in the North Atlantic bloc. The Republicans who provoked the resignation of the government and who, as the press points out, are known for their pro-Atlantic and pro-American sympathies, declared disagreement with the actions of B. Craxi and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, G. Andreotti, in the course of the events connected with the seizure of the "Achille Lauro" on 7 October. As is known, thanks to the self-restraint which was displayed and the wise approach of the Italian side, they were able to avoid imminent tragedy and save the lives of hundreds of passengers and crew members of the diesel ship.

The IPR's dissatisfaction was also caused by the fact that allegedly the Italian government did not consult with the Republicans in making the decision not to detain one of the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Front (PFO), Abul Abbas. He was on board an Egyptian civilian airplane, accompanying those who seized the "Achille Lauro." Taking off from the aircraft carrier "Saratoga" which was cruising in the Mediterranean, the American fighters forced the Egyptian airliner to land at a U.S. air force and naval base on the island of Sicily. Soon a large group of American "commandos" who were armed to the teeth landed there from two U.S. transport aircraft. A tense situation arose which almost led to an armed clash between the American assault force and the Italian carabinieri who were guarding the Egyptian airplane. Detaining the terrorists, the Italian authorities then gave Abdul Abbas the opportunity to leave the country unhindered, refusing to turn him over to the United States.

B. Craxi's speech in the Chamber of Deputies of the Italian parliament shed light on an entire series of details previously unknown to the broad public opinion and proved that Italy acted first and foremost on the basis of the country's interests and national sovereignty. Thus, for example, it was reported that G. Spadolini was abreast of all events. This confirmed an entire series of political observers in the opinion that the crisis, possibly, was provoked externally, that is, by the United States. New, scandalous piratical actions of the United States also became known. During the flight of the Egyptian airplane from Sicily to the Rome airport of Ciampino, declared B. Craxi, an American F-14 fighter made the attempt to escort it, and a U.S. Navy pilot, ignoring elementary international laws, refused to respond to the interrogations of the Italian fighters. The speech of the head of the government in parliament found broad support on the part of numerous political parties, including the communists. The imperial behavior of the United States and the public "lectures" of the American ambassador to Italy, M. Rabb, who openly expressed "dissatisfaction with the position of official Rome" caused the angry indignation of the country's democratic community. The influential Italian newspaper STAMPA called U.S. foreign policy "Wild West Diplomacy."

In accordance with the Italian constitution, the republic's President F. Cossiga has already begun a series of political consultations. It is expected that as early as the beginning of this week he will charge one of the political figures with the formation of a new government.

Totally Unusual Situation

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 85 p 5

[Article by G. Zafesov: "Components of a Crisis: Echo of the Week"]

[Text] Last week in Italy, the resignation of B. Craxi's cabinet took place under the sign of a government crisis. It had many causes and an inherent scheme, but it was caused by an "external factor" which will be discussed below.

The cabinet consisted of representatives of five parties: Christian Democrat, Socialist, Social Democrat, Republican, and Liberal. Disagreements between them in recent months acquired ever greater acuteness.

The leading conservative party of Italy--the Christian Democrats--began the autumn marathon with a substantial advantage. During the presidential elections which took place at the end of June, it succeeded in returning the post of head of state to its prominent figure, Francesco Cossiga. Having become president of the country, F. Cossiga, however, immediately officially left the CDP, justifying this by the fact that such a post should be occupied by a person who belongs to no political party.

The head of the cabinet, Socialist B. Craxi, was subjected to ever sharper attacks on the part of the Christian Democrats. Objectively, the government's achievements in domestic affairs, having been in power for more than two years, were modest. The run of inflation was slowed down a wee bit, but a dear price was paid for this--the Italian lira was devalued by six percent. However, Italy's activity in international collaboration increased somewhat. For example, an end was put to the "pause" in economic collaboration with the USSR. This permitted signing a number of important mutually advantageous contracts between the two countries. Industrial production revived somewhat in Italy in recent months.

If some clashes within the ruling coalition can be explained by the struggle for spheres of influence, the motives for the dissatisfaction of the broad masses with the state of affairs within the country bear a different, fundamental character. One of the main gains was virtually taken away from the workers--the "mobile wage scale" which formerly at least somehow compensated the working man for the giddy increase in prices. Now the "integration funds" from which benefits are paid to the unemployed are threatened.

Elimination of the "integration funds" may close the last valve through which dissatisfaction with social injustice was at least relieved somehow (according to data of the Bank of Italy, 436,000 people receive unemployment relief). The aid provided a small temporary respite for a person who found himself without work. It is not difficult to surmise that abolition would lead to an even more acute and dramatic situation and the polarization of wealth and poverty would become even sharper. Exploitation of those who retain a work place would intensify. In short, capital's frontal attack threatens great trouble.

One feature is typical of the present cycle of capitalist production: the enlivening of production which was contemplated did not weaken tension in the labor market. Unemployment continues to grow. The achievements of science, automation, and robotization are being transformed into an enemy of man, depriving him of a work place. The unemployed number three million in Italy according to data of the trade unions. A large group of them consists of persons up to 29 years of age.

In former years Italians left for foreign countries in search of a living, although with heavy heart. Now even this possibility is becoming illusory: for there are about 20 million unemployed in Western Europe.

The burden of the tremendous budget deficit of 110 trillion lira lays primarily on the shoulders of the workers. It is not by chance that a heated battle flared up around the law for financing for the year 1986; it raged within the walls of parliament and on the pages of the press and on the streets and squares of the country--hundreds of thousands of strikers went out on them. The essence of the law is reduced to a further reduction in appropriations for social needs, pension support, and education.

The closing of "unprofitable" railroad branch lines is being planned, which dooms many small cities of the country to even greater vegetation. The problem of the management of cities was sharply aggravated in general. Up to now, organs of local authority have not been created due to unresolved disagreements in many cities of the country, including the big ones, although elections took place back in May. The attempt is being made to create them following the model of a government coalition in which, as is known, the Italian Communist Party does not participate. However, this is prevented by the actual disposition of political forces locally where, despite some losses in the course of elections, the authority of the Italian Communist Party remains rather high. Political sober-mindedness is prevailing in some regions. The creation of a junta--the administrative organ of the city of Florence--can serve as an example. It included Socialists, Communists, Social Democrats, and Liberals. The Christian Democrats who were dissatisfied with such a turn of events kept aloof from participation in the junta.

But then an "external factor" intruded in Italy's internal situation--the hijacking of the diesel ship "Achille Lauro" which was conducting a cruise in the Mediterranean Sea. They were able to settle the conflict and free the vessel. The fact that one American tourist perished on the vessel gave the United States grounds for gross and unceremonious interference in the jurisdiction and competence of the Italian government. For the sake of fairness we note that representatives of many political forces did not heed the transatlantic call but right here the entire unsteadiness of the government coalition was revealed. The defense minister, G. Spadolini, a Republican, just as his party colleagues, considered that the government "destroyed the principle of collective leadership" in deciding the question concerning Italian sovereignty. If we discard the wordy shell, they wanted the government to listen more to the voice from across the ocean. And so the Republicans left the cabinet. The government was forced to resign.

Observers are now unanimous that it is difficult to recall in the country's postwar history a case where such a distinctly Italian governmental crisis

would have been provoked from abroad and arose due to disagreements not on domestic problems, although their acuteness is great, but on the foreign-policy course. For Italy, a country which is a proven ally of the United States and NATO, the situation is absolutely unusual. True, the transatlantic partner behaved so impudently and coarsely in regard to Italy that it caused a rebuff in the most diverse circles. And assumptions that the United States evidently prefers the blind subordination of its partners instead of allied relationships are not unfounded. In Washington, they did not even want to conceal their satisfaction concerning the crisis which broke out in Italy and they openly expressed the "hope" that the new government will be "more pro-American" than the previous one.

For the present, it is impossible to predict the outcome of the crisis. According to existing rules, the government will be in power right up to the formation of a new cabinet. B. Craxi has been charged with conducting consultations relative to the latter matter.

6367

CSO: 1807/095

WESTERN EUROPE

BRIEFS

GREEK-SOVIET SOCIETY MEMBERS IN ALMA-ATA--Alma-Ata KAZAKHISTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 85 carries on page 3 a 100-word item about a visiting delegation from the Greek-Soviet Society led by acting general secretary of the society, secretary of the Athens branch Afanasiy Panaretu. The delegation, invited by the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies, visited a school, a rug factory, a pioneer palace, museums, etc. [Editorial Report]

DUTCH JOURNALISTS IN ALMA-ATA--Alma-Ata KAZAKHISTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Oct 85 carries on page 3 a 100-word item about a group of Dutch journalists visiting Alma-Ata at the invitation of the leadership of the USSR Union of Journalists. The Dutch journalists were led by the president of the Netherlands Union of Journalists Max de (Bok). [Editorial Report]

TRADE UNION DELEGATION IN ARMENIA--Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 19 Sep 85 carries on page 2 a 100-word Armenpress item on a visiting delegation of FRG trade union representatives led by Julius (Lelbakh). They are becoming acquainted with the activities of the republic trade union organizations. [Editorial Report]

CSO: 1807/116-P

FASTERN EUROPE

BULGARIA: SCIENTIFIC, TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS PRAISED

Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 36, Sep 85 p 20

[Article by B. Panov: "The People's Republic of Bulgaria -- Horizons of Scientific-Technical Progress"]

[Text] On 9 September the People's Republic of Bulgaria is celebrating a great holiday, the 41st anniversary of the socialist revolution in that country. During the years of people's power Bulgaria has been transformed into a developed socialist state, and has now taken up the path of allout intensification of public production. The article below relates some of the ways they are meeting these challenges on the basis of scientific-technical progress.

Scientific-technical progress ... Reconstruction ... Modernization. These words are perhaps the most popular ones in Bulgaria today. They are heard from the podium of party forums and meetings of economic aktivs, on television screens, and are spread in millions of newspaper issues. They represent both the current achievements of the Bulgarian people and their intentions for the country's future, for the development of socialist society.

On a Solid Foundation

Mastering the advances of the scientific-technical revolution was a constituent element of social building in Bulgaria. Party economic policy is permeated with these ideas.

In February 1985 a plenum of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee discussed certain new views and approaches to planning and implementing Bulgarian Scientific Technical policy. The goal of this was a radical turn toward raising the efficiency of the economy by making maximum use of achievements in the area of Science and Technology.

With technical assistance from the USSR and in cooperation with the other socialist states, during the years of socialist building Bulgaria has established contemporary industry and a signif — scientific base. The country produces roughly as much industrial output ee days now as was produced in all of 1939. Sectors such as electrical engineering, robotics, machine building, metallurgy, petrochemistry, and power engineering were built practically from nothing. Significant changes took place in agriculture, transportation, and other sectors of the economy.

The country has hundreds of scientific and engineering-application organizations in operation today. About 80,000 people are employed in the spheres of science and application of scientific developments; 23,000 of them are scientific workers. In 1984 more than 200 scientific-technical innovations and inventions were introduced, giving a national economic effect of more than 125 million levs.

While praising past accomplishments, Bulgarian communists make a critical analysis of the state of affairs in various spheres of economic life and emphasize the need to create an atmosphere of creative labor in labor collectives, striving for a psychological reorientation in the approach to meeting contemporary challenges of stepping up scientific-technical progress.

The Search for Efficient Paths of Development

In order to move ahead rapidly in the strategic areas and convert the economy to an intensive footing, it has been decided to greatly improve the planning principle in managing science and scientific-technical progress. The challenge has been posed of making scientific-technical progress the starting point and pivot of planning.

At the same time the state is making greater demands with respect to insuring higher economic efficiency in the activity of enterprises and giving them incentive to introduce scientific and technical advances as quickly as possible. The Bulgarian comrades see a guarantee of success in renouncing excessive over-seeing of enterprises, in strengthening centralized planning with a concurrent broadening and increase in the responsibility of labor collectives.

A significant reorientation of investment policy has been outlined. The point of the new approach is to direct up to 70 percent of capital investment to renewal of production capacities, to their reconstruction and modernization. In addition to building new capacities, large industrial combines and technological lines are being expanded and reconstructed in Sofia, Pernik, Kremikovtsy, Dimitrograd, Yambol, Burgas, Vidin, Devno, and other cities.

The plan for the 9th Five-Year Plan (1986-1990) is being worked out with due regard for the new challenges. Paramount attention is being given to science-intensive, automated production facilities that use resource-conserving and no-waste technologies, to reducing the materials-intensiveness of output produced, and to carrying out major national programs for introduction of electronics, automation, new materials, and bioengineering.

Special emphasis is being put on improving the quality of finished output. The main lines of this work were defined by the March 1984 National Party Conference and the Long-Term Party Program to Raise Quality adopted at this meeting. The Bulgarian Communist Party is striving to convert this important program to the language of practical affairs as quickly as possible. Among other things they are studying the possibility of setting up a national council on problems of output quality with participation on an equal basis by representatives of state organs, organizations of producers and consumers, and public organizations.

A search is underway for ways to integrate science with production in order to make the scientific elements an inseparable part of production. One form of direct link between science and production is expected to be program scientific

collectives which would include representatives of different scientific establishments joined by specialists from the appropriate production organizations. It is envisioned that such collectives will be formed and will work under contract to enterprises for a single purpose -- obtaining a scientific result on a particular topic. The activity of these collectives can be evaluated by program councils which include, in addition to scientists, representatives of client organizations and economic organizations engaged in practical introduction of scientific developments.

The issue of bolstering state-public principles in the management of science and scientific-technical progress is also being widely discussed in Bulgaria.

Overall the long-range strategy of the Bulgarian Communist Party in the area of science is based on a combination of a policy of supporting scientific potential in all the fields that determine the contemporary make-up of sciences and concentrating efforts in those areas which are most closely tied to the country's economic development and Bulgaria's participation in the international division of labor, and where the necessary preconditions have already been created for intensive scientific research and application activity to insure decisive movement forward. This strategy aims first of all at the development of new technologies that make it possible to broaden the country's raw material base, in particular to make use of certain local raw materials that are not suited for processing by traditional methods. Results have already been achieved in this. For example, a new technology for burning low-calorie coals has already been successfully introduced at a number of TES's in Bulgaria, and the prime cost of electricity produced in this way is one-third lower than the average figure.

Accelerating scientific-technical progress in the country also demands further improvement of the entire system of education and retraining of workers. It is planned to improve vocational education on the basis of the uniform 12-year polytechnical secondary school and to work harder to see that young specialists at higher educational institutions receive multifield training. The first programming competition for secondary students in the capital city was held in early 1985. A new series of microcomputers for schools is being incorporated. A contest is underway for the best scientific-technical development projects. The network of "Computer" clubs established in the country is playing an important part in training and retraining workers for using computers.

Through United Efforts

Reaching the front lines of scientific-technical progress is a difficult task. Bulgaria today is refining certain components of the unified mechanism for planning and managing this important process, and the experience of the USSR in this area is being studied and introduced actively. "We are aware," Comrade T. Zhivkov stresses, "that Bulgaria is not alone in carrying out the scientific-technical revolution. Our country relies on the might of the entire socialist community, on the might of the Council for Economic Mutual Aid, and especially on scientific-technical and economic integration with the Soviet Union."

Economic and scientific-technical ties between Bulgaria and the Soviet Union are developed in conformity with the Comprehensive Program for Socialist Economic

Integration and the long-term target programs of cooperation among CEMA members in the sectors of material production. Bulgaria's participation in carrying them out has insured stable economic development for the country and made it possible to accomplish profound qualitative changes in the structure of the national economy.

Bulgaria participates actively in joint scientific-technical development projects carried on by the CEMA countries. The Master Plan for specialization and collaboration between the USSR and Bulgaria in the area of material production to the year 1990 and the sectorial programs of cooperation worked out on its basis are having a major impact on deepening the process of cooperation. Cooperation in the field of science and technology is a component of this Master Plan.

Each year the range of ties which insure an increased pace of joint work in the sphere of scientific-technical progress broadens. Cooperation in this area is based on planning with emphasis on working out comprehensive scientific-technical programs. Coordinated problem areas encompass more than 280 sectorial scientific-technical problems and a number of comprehensive target programs and fundamental topics, including ones in the priority areas of science and technology. More than 300 Soviet and Bulgarian scientific research institutes and planning-design organizations are participating in their development. The Interprogramma Institute, the Elektroinstrument Science-Production Association, and the Sovbulgartsvetmet [Soviet-Bulgarian Nonferrous Metallurgy] Design Bureau are working together successfully. Rich experience is being gathered in joint development projects to design equipment, instruments, materials, industrial processes, and models of new machinery.

The economic summit conference of CEMA countries held last year gave new impetus to both the development of Soviet-Bulgarian ties and to Bulgaria's cooperation with other CEMA members. Considering all-out acceleration of scientific-technical progress to be especially timely, participants at the meeting agreed on joint development, on the basis of national programs, of a Comprehensive Program of Scientific-Technical Progress for 15-20 Years as the basis for working out coordinated, and in some fields unified, scientific-technical policy.

The Long-Term Program for Development of Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the USSR and Bulgaria in the Period until the Year 2000 was signed in June 1984. In this all-encompassing document the parties emphasize that their long-term economic and scientific-technical cooperation is in the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Bulgarian peoples.

11176

CSO: 1825/119

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

LATIN AMERICAN REGIMES, ECONOMIES HIT

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Sep 85 p 3

[Article by Maj V. Laptev: "Latin America: The Collapse of Dictatorships"]

[Text] Over the last decade, many Latin American countries have been reminiscent of a military camp. The chairs of the heads of state have been occupied by persons in general's uniforms. Armed soldiers have patrolled the streets of the cities and villages and tanks have guarded governmental institutions. Endless military maneuvers have rumbled across the testing ranges. The arms race has achieved an unprecedented scale. From 1973 through 1982, military expenditures of the Latin American states increased from 8 billion dollars to 16.5 billion. The military tribunals administered justice and meted out punishment.

The start of the 20 years of military dictatorships was marked by the overthrow of the Brazilian President Joao Goulart in 1964 (somewhat previously power in Paraguay had been usurped by Gen Stroessner). A wave of military putsches engulfed the continent: Bolivia in 1971, Chile and Uruguay in 1973, Argentina in 1976....

Latin America is familiar with military coups. Over the last 150 years there have been over 500 of them. However, never before have they engulfed so many countries simultaneously and never before has the army so actively intervened literally in all areas of social life, in politics, the economy and ideology. For the first time the military carried out repressive functions on such a scale and did this with unprecedented cruelty. For the first time the armed forces so cynically sacrificed national interests to the great-power ambitions of the United States.

What is this, an accidental zig-zag in the continent's history? In no way. The transition to dictatorial forms of rule was dictated by the needs of imperialist development. The collapse of the world colonial system which substantially limited the sphere of investing capital forced the transnational corporations [TNC], and primarily the U.S. monopolies, to cast their glances at Latin America. In working out plans to intensify economic expansion on the continent, the TNC found allies in the form of the local financial oligarchy. With the aid of foreign investments, they planned on overcoming the stagnation in the national economy, modernizing it and gaining access to the advanced

technology of the foreign firms and thereby strengthening their positions on the domestic and world markets. In recognizing that the realization of these measures would entail superexploitation of the workers and the plundering of national wealth as well as cause resistance from the masses of people, the ruling circles of the United States and the Latin American states were concerned with protecting the interests of the monopolies using the bayonets of military dictatorships. Another circumstance which contributed to the assuming of power by dictatorial regimes was the desire of Washington to stifle the national liberation struggle on the continent. The Latin American military was suitable for this purpose like no one else. More than three-quarters of the generals and officers in the armies of the continent's countries had been trained in the schools of the Pentagon where they had been indoctrinated in a spirit of hate for the liberation movement.

In coming to power, the generals energetically set to work embodying in practice the theory taught to them. They restricted civil liberties, they disbanded parliaments, they prohibited the activities of political parties and trade unions and set up an extensive network of special services. In accord with recommendations by economists from the Chicago school headed by Milton Friedman, Brazil was the first to throw open the doors to foreign capital. Attracted by cheap raw materials and labor force, the foreign firms raced to open their affiliates. The abundant injections of dollars at first stimulated an economic revival in the country. The entire world spoke about the "Brazilian miracle." But the "miracle" a hollow one. Being unable to compete with the foreign firms, the national enterprises were forced to curtail production. The drop in prices for agricultural products inspired by the industrially developed countries hit the peasants hard. The uncontrolled influx of capital led to a rapid rise in external debt of the Latin American states. The increase in the bank interest rate in the United States increased this debt many-fold. The TNC, having pumped billions in profits from the region's states, began to curtail their activities, leaving behind them, according to evidence of the Prensa Latina Agency, "worked out mines and pits, poisoned rivers and lakes, sterile lands, hopelessly obsolete equipment and a labor force not prepared for the age of industrialization." Mass unemployment which engulfed up to a third of the working-age population, the unrestrained increase in prices and the reduction in worker wages and subsidies for necessities fired the situation on the continent to the limit. Unable to find a way out of the developing situation, the dictatorial regimes unleashed all their repressive might on the "domestic enemy," the peoples of their countries. The 9,000 killed and missing in Argentina, the 30,000 killed in Chile, one out of every third Paraguayan and one out of every five Uruguayan in political immigration, the overcrowded prisons -- these were the "victories" of the generals. Brought to despair by hunger, poverty and a lack of rights, the peoples began to rise to struggle against the military dictatorships. Under the pressure of broad opposition from the workers to the petty and middle bourgeoisie, the army was forced to return to the barracks.

The generals left in various ways. In Brazil and Uruguay, this was a slow retreat accompanied by energetic maneuvers by the juntas. Without waiting for democratization to be carried out from below by decisive actions of the masses, the military regime in Brazil established the appearance of liberalization from above. An announcement was made on halting the action of

certain repressive laws, on a partial amnesty for political prisoners and for lifting the ban on the activities of political parties. The political emigres were permitted to return to the nation. By these measures the junta endeavored to dampen the intensity of universal indignation in order to put their minions in the presidential elections. In Uruguay, the military which for a long time had refused any dialogue with the opposition, under the pressure of mass actions by virtually the entire population was forced to seek ways for an "honorable" retreat through a dialogue with the moderate political parties. However, the maneuvers were not crowned with success. In 1985, in both countries civil administrations came to power headed by moderate bourgeois leaders, Tancredo Neves in Brazil (after his death, the post of president was filled by Jose Sarney) and Julio Sanguinetti in Uruguay.

In Argentina the collapse of the junta of Gen Galtieri was accelerated by the defeat in the military conflict with Great Britain over the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands and by which the ruling clique had hoped to divert the people's attention from acute socioeconomic problems. However, the war, on the contrary, disclosed the political shortsightedness, the professional incompetence and adventurism of the military regime. On 10 December 1983, the presidential palace, the "Casa Rosada" ("Pink House") was occupied by the leader of the Civil Radical Union Raul Alfonsin who was victorious in general elections. The military junta ended up in the court docket.

In Bolivia, where military rule had alternated with civil rule, Gen Garcia Mesa, in coming to power in 1980, had intended to break this tradition. Alas, he held out for just 2 years. But during this time Mesa was able to finally shatter the national economy and bring the workers to complete impoverishment.

At present, in the countries of the Southern Cone, as the south of the Latin American Continent is called, two fascist dictatorships remain: Stroessner in Paraguay and Pinochet in Chile. Stroessner who is guarded by Nazi criminals has 30 years of "experience" in suppressing the people. Universal surveillance and total terror have driven the flames of popular indignation inwards but sooner or later they will burst forth. The situation in Chile is now such that Washington, judging from all appearances, is not against removing Pinochet for a less odious political figure in order to leave the essence of the regime unchanged. However, the nation's workers are fully determined not to permit the mere "changing of shop signs."

The civilian governments which have come to power in Latin America, upon the demand of the masses, have begun democratic transformations. The ban has been lifted on the activities of the trade unions and leftist parties, including the communist party (in Bolivia, communists have entered the government). The political emigres are returning home. Brazil and Bolivia have established trade and economic relations with Cuba. Uruguay is also thinking about restoring diplomatic relations with the Isle of Liberty. A majority of the governments supports the struggle of Nicaragua for independence.

The advance of the continent's nations along the path of democracy is impeded by the difficult economic heritage left by the military juntas. For 4 years now the region's economy has been marking time while the population has increased by almost 10 percent. The number of fully and partially unemployed

exceeds 100 million. The external debt has reached the astronomic amount of 360 billion dollars. The Reagan Administration by increasing the bank credit rates has forced the Latin American peoples to pay off the arms race initiated by it. "The economic crisis in the Latin American countries and the external indebtedness of the region are an international problem involving democracy, economic stability and even peace," considers the Venezuelan President J. Lusinchi. Among the government leaders of the continent, there is a growing understanding of the need for a joint rebuff to the financial dictatorship of imperialism headed by the United States. Clear confirmation of this was the meeting in Havana of the state, political and social leaders of Latin America and the Caribbean Basin to discuss the problems of the foreign indebtedness of the continent's countries. The meeting was called upon Cuban initiative and brought together more than 1,200 delegates. A majority of the participants in the "continental dialogue" were in favor of refusing to pay the excessive foreign debt imposed on the region's countries by imperialism.

The unity and solidarity of the democratic forces and primarily the workers are essential because the reaction has not accepted defeat. Inspired and supported by the United States, it is endeavoring to benefit from the existing difficulties, undermine confidence in the civilian governments and spread chaos in order to attempt to recover power.

10272

CSO: 1807/45

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

PINOCHET'S POSITION 'DETERIORATING'

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 41, Oct 85 pp 25-27

[Article by Igor Rybalkin]

[Text]

September comes to Chile as if to remind people with its anniversaries of important events in the country's history. September 18 is a national holiday—the day that in 1810 marked the start of the country's independence from Spanish colonial domination. In the days of the bourgeois democratic system, presidential elections were held on September 4. The Christian Democrat Eduardo Frei won these elections in 1964, and his government carried out a number of reforms. In September 1970, victory at the polls went to Salvador Allende, a candidate of the Left coalition. Three years later, on September 11, now a black day in the Chilean calendar, the Allende government was overthrown by the fascist military which established a ruthless dictatorship.

With its reminders of past events, both happy and sad, September makes one wonder how much longer the military-fascist regime can hold out in spite of overwhelming evidence that the vast majority of Chileans are against it.

A further reason for the question arising now is that in recent years considerable shifts have taken place in the struggle of the democratic forces against the dictatorship. The anti-dictatorship movement has acquired a mass nature, especially in 1983-84. There has been a consolidation of political opposition, expressed in the creation and activity of coalitions of opposition parties and groupings: the Right-of-Centre Dem-

ocratic Alliance, the Left-wing Popular Democratic Movement and between these two the Socialist bloc.

Reliance on the Army

Support from the army is one of the main factors enabling Pinochet to retain power. No upheavals substantially undermining the reliability of this pillar of the regime have yet occurred. True, Pinochet is always having to reshuffle the top military. In August he had to part with Cesar Mendoza, a member of the military junta and commander of the carabineers referred to as a rogue general by Allende in his last radio address to the Chilean people.

The general's departure occurred in unpleasant circumstances for the regime: the investigation of the brutal murder of three opposition leaders, started under pressure from indignant public opinion, revealed the complicity of senior carabineer officers in the crime. The facts proved so odious that together with Cesar Mendoza, who had earlier claimed the murder was the "doing of Communists," resignations were submitted by 29 generals and officers. The dictator had no way out but to accept Mendoza's resignation in an attempt to dissociate himself from the crimes.

Of course, public dissatisfaction with the policy of the regime cannot but evoke some response among servicemen because the army is not totally isolated from society and soldiers and non-commissioned of-

ficers cannot fail to see the sufferings and privations of their families and friends. But there exists a strict "vertical" military discipline and ideological brainwashing with emphasis on "national security."

The situation in the armed forces is obviously also influenced by the fact that servicemen fear retribution for what they have done in the past in the event of a change of government. This unites them with the sense of "shared responsibility" and impels them to defend the regime.

Nonetheless, the way in which the situation is developing and the growth of the mass anti-dictatorship movement cannot fail to instill in at least some of the senior officers a feeling of alarm, and doubts about the expediency of Pinochet's remaining in power.

Washington Supports Pinochet

Support by ruling circles in the United States is another factor facilitating the preservation of the military-fascist regime. The U.S. Administration's favourable attitude to the regime is lately becoming increasingly obvious despite Washington's occasional statements about "concern" over the situation in Chile and the desirability of a "return to democracy." This was confirmed by the visit to Chile in February of this year, at the height of the state of emergency, of a special envoy of President Reagan, the then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Lazhorne Motley.

The results of the visit were summed up by Motley himself when he stated that Washington would not increase pressure on Pinochet to introduce changes in his authoritarian system. This was in line with the conclusion drawn on the eve of the visit in a secret report by the U.S. Department of State: all things considered, Pinochet will be president till 1997. In the opinion of the U.S. Administration, the report says, the "moderate opposition" cannot guarantee that Left-wing forces will not come to power after the military junta's collapse.

For this reason Washington has decided on an accord between Pinochet's ruling regime and the "moderate opposition" in order to prevent an alliance between the Christian Democrats and Left-wing forces and

isolate the Communist Party and the other more resolute anti-dictatorship forces.

This also explains the financial assistance to Pinochet's dictatorship. The Reagan Administration is putting pressure on international financial bodies to make them more generous in giving loans to the dictatorial regime. Recently, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) succumbed to pressure from Washington and approved the granting to Chile of a more than \$820 million loan on extremely easy terms.

Situation in the Opposition Camp

The support given by the United States to the Pinochet regime would not have enabled it to stay in power until today if the opposition forces had acted in concert and if their joint action had not been impeded by differing views on the methods to be used in the struggle to restore democracy. The events connected with the so-called "national accord on transition to full democracy" give an idea of the situation in the opposition camp and relations between the forces comprising it.

This agreement was worked out in response to an appeal for "national reconciliation" made by Cardinal Fresno, the Archbishop of Santiago. Representatives of eleven political parties and groupings signed it on August 25 this year. In addition to members of the Democratic Alliance and the Socialist bloc it was also signed by the leaders of the National Party and the National Union Movement, organizations that were connected until recently with the "non-opposition Rightists" (that is those supporting the government). Left-wing parties belonging to the Popular Democratic Movement, including the Communist Party, were not invited to take part in drafting the document.

The participants in the "national accord" proclaim as their aims "peaceful evolution towards full and genuine democracy," an "orderly transfer of political power to those who are endowed with it in accordance with indisputable democratic legality" and the return of the armed forces "to the fulfilment of their indispensable permanent functions."

Among the "immediate measures" necessary to "give Chileans back their

civil rights" the agreement includes the abolition of the state of emergency, full restoration of civil freedoms and real autonomy for universities, return of people banished from the country, the lifting of the ban on the activities of political parties and the adoption of a law on the election of the president, senators and deputies by direct and secret ballot.

The "national accord," however, does not set any specific time for the "transition to democracy" and, most importantly, does not make this transition dependent on the removal of Pinochet from power. It is not clear how it is intended to carry out measures for democratization. The parties to the accord seem to pin their hopes on an agreement with the present repressive regime by means of "arguments of reason," by impressing the government with the broadness of their ranks and the fact that they are not allied with the more resolute opponents of the dictatorship.

The vagueness of much of the wording in the "national accord" reflects the heterogeneity of the forces participating in it, which include both those who reject "dialogue" with Pinochet and conciliators, those who are in favour of talks with him.

It is noteworthy that Washington has qualified the agreement as "positive" and expressed satisfaction with efforts directed at "reconciling the political forces and reaching agreement on a peaceful and orderly transition to democracy." To "come to terms" with the Pinochet regime!

The Popular Democratic Movement has stated that it recognizes the importance of the step taken by 11 opposition parties but sees in it also attempts to keep other forces out of the opposition front and lack of resolve to put an end to the existing regime. Noting that it regards the earliest possible abolition of the dictatorship as "the prime and indispensable condition for the reconciliation of Chileans and a return to a democratic system," the movement has not supported the agreement as a whole.

The Communists' Stance

As to the Communist Party, its principled position was clearly defined still earlier. "We Communists," reads a letter from the Communist

Party of Chile to the leadership of the Christian Democratic Party in connection with the polemic on methods of overthrowing the dictatorship, "adhere to the concept of a constant and steadily developing conflict as against the tendencies towards reconciliation with the dictatorship that are manifesting themselves in some opposition circles, as against the delusion that it is supposedly possible to reach an agreement with Pinochet that will lead to a rebirth of democracy... A concept according to which some sort of way out through compromise is possible hinders the struggle against the dictatorship and obstructs the necessary unity of democratic forces."

Later, in an interview for the major Chilean newspaper *El Mercurio*, which evoked widespread response, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, Luis Corvalan, specified: "The removal of General Pinochet is an essential step... I do not expect voluntary abdication from him but I think that the strength of the people and the evolution of the crisis of the regime could, even if not forcing him to resign, create a situation which would predetermine his departure in one way or another. We opposed and continue to oppose the policy of dialogue with the present regime. Those who conducted dialogue and are inclined to conduct it now are accepting the idea of reconciliation and falling for Pinochet's tricks. But his departure could create favourable conditions for a really constructive dialogue with representatives of the armed forces with the aim of achieving genuine democracy."

The Communist Party's attitude to the "national accord" is in line with this clear and consistent position. In its appeal "To the Chilean People" the Communist Party pointed out that this accord reflects the crisis of the dictatorship and that its appearance was undoubtedly caused by the present scope of popular action for the earliest possible abolition of Pinochet's regime. The Party noted the existence of positive aspects in the document, taking into account such pressing demands of the people as the need to observe human rights, restore democracy, and bring back the expelled. At the same time the Communist Party draws attention to the "obvious limitations" of the doc-

ument, and first of all to the absence in it of concrete proposals concerning the need to end the dictatorship before 1989 — the date till which Pinochet holds the presidential office.

The Communist Party called on all opposition forces without exception for joint militant action with the use of all suitable forms of struggle.

So the CPC did not accede to the "national accord" but neither did it reject it. At a secret meeting with journalists in Santiago (a UPI correspondent was among them), the members of the CPC underground leadership explained: "We cannot sign a document which does not take into account our view and contains a number of points with which we do not agree." At the same time the CPC representatives stated that the Communists "will not stand in the way of the political forces that support the 'national accord' and express readiness to cooperate with them."

New Tide of Action

And how did the government receive the "national accord"? Pinochet rejected it out of hand saying that the government would not deviate from the road mapped out by the Constitution, in other words that he would remain in power till 1989 and, possibly, even till 1997, and does not intend to allow a restoration of democracy. Pinochet's speech on the occasion of the 12th anniversary of the fascist coup also confirmed the futility of hopes expressed in some circles of the bourgeois opposition of reaching an agreement with him on "transition to full democracy." Along with this the government tried to cover up its refusal to study the proposals contained in the accord by

claiming that the ideas of this document "coincide with the aims and programmes pursued by the government" and do not contradict the provisions of the Pinochet constitution.

The existence of two tendencies in the opposition camp — towards "dialogue" with the regime and the striving to put an end to it as quickly as possible by launching an even broader anti-dictatorship movement — clearly made itself felt during the mass actions that were resumed with renewed force in September.

A new Day of National Protest was set for September 4 on the initiative of the National Guiding Council of Working People. This initiative was supported by trade union associations, organizations of students and residents in workers' settlements. It was joined by the Popular Democratic Movement and initially also by the Democratic Alliance. But the signing of the "national accord" was used by the advocates of "dialogue" as a means of preventing the mobilization of the masses. On August 31 Cardinal Fresno called on "Chileans of good will" to "refrain from acts of protest." After this the Democratic Alliance revised its initial decision.

Although these conciliating moves did exert a restraining influence, the Day of National Protest was held on a truly countrywide scale. This could not be prevented either by police and army units or by new arrests, roundups and murders. Anti-government actions continued in subsequent days as well. A new wave of these actions swept the country on September 11, the anniversary of the fascist coup. Broad sections of Chile's population clearly demonstrated their will to press for the immediate abolition of Pinochet's tyranny. The dictatorship's position is deteriorating.

/9274

CSO: 1812/35

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

MOUNTING PROTESTS IN ROK NOTED

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Oct 85 p 5

[Article by Sergey Tikhomirov: "Protests Mount"]

[Text] The capital of South Korea has again been engulfed by antigovernment demonstrations. Over 10,000 students participated in the recent largest demonstration in the last 5 years against the antipopular policy of the Seoul regime. They demanded the release of their comrades from arrest and the restoring of democracy in the nation.

In endeavoring to suppress the dissatisfaction, the South Korean regime has attempted to "decapitate" the youth movement and in recent weeks around 100 student leaders have been thrown behind bars. At the same time, the authorities have not given up in their intention to push through parliament "a draft law to ensure tranquility in the universities." The first such attempt failed but even now orders have been issued to build new concentration camps for the "rebels" from among the student youth. However, the repression of Seoul has not succeeded. On the contrary, the flames of discontent burn ever-stronger. Over the first 6 months of the current year, over a million persons participated in demonstrations and meetings.

Characteristically, recently the focus of these actions has changed. More and more this is aimed against Washington policy on the Korean Peninsula. In the most diverse strata of the South Korean population an awareness is growing of how unseemly a role has been played and is being played by the United States in setting the policy of Seoul. For this reason at present not only the students and the progressive intelligentsia but also representatives of the "official" opposition often criticize Washington for its policy in the region. Thus, the leader of the largest opposition party in the South Korean Parliament, Kim En Sam, recently stated that "the United States is seeking to maintain a military dictatorship in the country (South Korea. -- S. T.) and not in carrying out democratic changes. As a sign of protest against the repression of the authorities, a group of delegates boycotted the work of the National Assembly for 10 days.

While in Seoul the protests multiply and numerous demonstrations are held with the demand that the United States cease supporting the Draconian orders ruling in the southern part of the Korean Peninsula, highly-placed officials in

Washington are making ambiguous statements that the position of the United States "perfectly obviously consists in supporting a transition to democracy."

But precisely the reverse is true. The regime imposed on South Korea 40 years ago and which for all these years has rested on the bayonets of the Pentagon is not to the liking of the South Korean people. The realization is growing that only by a decisive struggle can they put an end to foreign domination in the country and achieve authentic democratic changes.

10272

CSO: 1807/45

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

BRIEFS

INDIAN YOUTH DELEGATES VISIT TASHKENT--Tashkent YOSHI LENINCHI in Uzbek 7 Aug 1985 carries on page 1 a 400-word article by Sh. Masharipov titled "Indian Delegates in Tashkent." The article discusses the visit to Tashkent by Indian delegates who had been at the Moscow Youth Festival. In excerpts of interviews printed in YOSHI LENINCHI, the delegates spoke of the success of the Moscow festival and the warm welcome in Tashkent. A reception held for the Indians was attended by Uzbekistan Komsomol Secretaries H.H. Hamidov and M.A. Rahimberdiyeva, and Chairman of the republic Organization of Youth R.N. Toshtemirova. The article is accompanied by six photographs of the Indians and those who welcomed them. [Editorial Report]

CS0: 1807/116-P

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

USSR-ANGOLA AGREEMENT ON SCIENTIFIC, CULTURAL EXCHANGES

Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SOYUZA SOVETSKIKH SOTSIALISTI-
CHESKIKH RESPUBLIK in Russian No 12, 1985 pp 176-184

[Protocol for Cultural and Scientific Cooperation between the USSR and People's
Republic of Angola, signed in Luanda, 22 May 1985]

[Text] Protocol for Cultural and Scientific Cooperation between the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of
Angola for 1985-1986

In accordance with the Agreement on Cultural and Scientific Cooperation between
the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of
the People's Republic of Angola, signed in Moscow on May 26, 1976, the
Contracting Sides agree to the following cultural and scientific exchange for
the years 1985-86:

Section I

The Soviet Side will grant to the Angolan Side two hundred (200) scholarships
for study in higher and secondary specialized educational institutions in the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and will increase the number of
scholarships in 1986 to three hundred (300). Areas of specialization to be
studied by Angolan citizens in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the
number of scholarships for each kind of education (higher and secondary
specialized) will be determined more precisely between the Sides.

Data concerning candidates for study shall be presented to the Soviet Side by
June 30 of each year and shall include educational diplomas, chosen areas of
specialization and health certificates. The National Institute on Grants of
the People's Republic of Angola will bear the travel expenses for Angolan
citizens from Luanda to Moscow. The Ministry of Higher and Secondary
Specialized Education of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will bear the
travel expenses for Angolan citizens from Moscow to Luanda after their
successful graduation from secondary and higher educational institutions in the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Section 2

The Soviet Side will grant to the Angolan Side up to 10 scholarships annually for graduate study in Soviet institutions of higher education. Preference will be given to Angolan citizens who complete their higher education in Soviet institutions of higher education.

Documents for students entering graduate school shall be submitted no later than April 1 of each year.

The Soviet Side will grant up to 15 scholarships annually for participation in special study programs lasting from 3 to 6 months to Angolan citizens who have graduated from institutions of higher education. Specialization fields and dates of the study program will be agreed upon by the Sides through consultation.

Section 3

During the period of this Protocol's validity, the Sides will conduct negotiations on signing a Protocol for documenting the equivalencies of education, study levels and professional status conferred and awarded in both countries.

Section 4

The Soviet Side will annually send a representative of the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for a period of up to 8 days, to render advisory aid to the Angolan Side in selecting students for matriculation in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Section 5

During the period of this Protocol's validity, the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send, at the request of the Angolan Side, teachers to work under contract at the University of Angola. The number and specialties of such teachers will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

Section 6

The Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send teachers of Russian language to work in the National Languages Institute for a period of two (2) years at the expense of the Soviet Side.

Section 7

1. The Russian Language Institute imeni A. S. Pushkin will send textbooks and literature on Russian-language learning methods to the National Languages Institute of the People's Republic of Angola.

2. At the request of the Angolan Side, the Soviet Side will send specialists from the Russian Language Institute imeni A. S. Pushkin to the Languages Institute of the People's Republic of Angola to participate in improving study plans and programs.

3. The Russian Language Institute imeni A. S. Pushkin will receive Angolan students and teachers of the Languages Institute to participate in special study programs in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Section 8

The State Committee for Industrial Trade Education of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will receive annually:

1. up to 30 Angolan citizens for study in industrial pedagogical tekhnikums.

2. up to 20 Angolan industrial trade education specialists to participate in the Program for Raising Qualifications of Managers and Specialists in Industrial Trade Education, for a period of up to three months.

3. three industrial trade education specialists of the People's Republic of Angola to become acquainted with the procedure for preparing qualified workers for industry and agriculture, for a period of up to 14 days;

4. In 1985 and 1986, the Soviet Side will send, and the Angolan Side will receive, three industrial trade education specialists from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to render advisory aid to industrial trade educational institutions of the People's Republic of Angola established through technical cooperation with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for a period of up to 14 days.

Section 9

The Sides will promote further expansion of the cooperation between Friendship of Peoples University imeni Patrice Lumumba and Agostinho Neto University, through mutual exchanges of scientific documents and information, and also of teachers, graduate students and exchange students.

The Sides will work together to establish cooperation between Agostinho Neto University and Moscow State University.

Section 10

The Sides will regularly exchange pedagogical documents, study programs and plans and copies of textbooks and study aids. The Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will supply the Angolan Side with copies of Soviet textbooks.

Section 11

During this Protocol's period of validity, the Africa Institute of the Academy

of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and appropriate scientific institutions of the People's Republic of Angola will exchange one research fellow from each Side for lecturing and conducting scientific research on topics to be agreed upon, for a period of up to one month.

Section 12

Soviet physicians and secondary medical personnel will continue work in the People's Republic of Angola in accordance with signed agreements and contracts.

Section 13

The Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send, and the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will receive, in 1985:

1. a dance ensemble consisting of 30 persons, for a period of 14 days;
2. the "Great Victory" exhibit with two accompanying assistants, for a period of 15 days;
3. two specialists for rendering advisory aid to the National Library of Angola, for a period of 14 days;
4. one specialist for work under contract in cultural establishments, for a period of one year.

The Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send, and the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will receive, in 1986:

5. a group of stage entertainers consisting of 25 persons, for a period of 15 days;
6. a group of artists consisting of 12 persons, for a period of 7 days;
7. the "Soviet Lifestyle" exhibit, for a period of 14 days, with two accompanying assistants.

Section 14

1. During 1985, at dates to be agreed upon, the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will send a folklore group consisting of 30 persons, for a period of 14 days. The ensemble will be received by the Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. During 1985, at dates to be agreed upon, the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will send, and the Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will receive, two (2) specialists for studying experience in the field of library organization. The specialists will be in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 10 days.

3. During 1985, the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will send, and the Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will receive, a group of specialists consisting of 20 persons to participate in the Program for Raising Qualifications, for a period of 30 days.

4. In 1986, the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will send, and the Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will receive, an exhibit of traditional Angolan art with two accompanying assistants, for a period of 15 days.

5. In 1986, the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will send, and the Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will receive, a group of artists consisting of 30 persons, for a period of up to 14 days.

Section 15

1. The State Committee for Cinematography of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Angolan Film Institute will arrange the second meeting of the abovementioned cinematographic organizations in 1985, in Luanda, with the aim of analyzing cooperation in the area of cinematography.

With this aim the State Committee for Cinematography of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send to Luanda a delegation consisting of three persons, for a period of 10 days.

2. The Soviet Side (the State Committee for Cinematography of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) will arrange Soviet Film Weeks, dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the Victory over Fascism and the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Delegations of film officials consisting of two persons each will be sent to participate in the Soviet Film Weeks, for a period of 7 days.

3. The Angolan Side (the Angolan Film Institute) will arrange Angolan Film Weeks annually in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Delegations of film officials consisting of two persons each will be sent to participate in the Angolan Film Weeks, for a period of 7 days.

4. In 1986, the Soviet Side (the State Committee for Cinematography of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) will arrange in the the People's Republic of Angola a Soviet Film Week, dedicated to the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. A delegation of film officials consisting of two persons will be sent to participate in the Soviet Film Week, for a period of 7 days.

5. The Sides will continue the exchange of domestically produced documentary and popular science television films on the topics of "Education and Study" and "Science and Art."

6. The State Committee for Cinematography of the Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics will continue cooperating with the Angolan film library through an exchange of cinema archival materials (motion pictures).

Section 16

The Angolan Film Institute will send, and the USSR State Committee for Cinematography will receive, a delegation of Angolan film officials consisting of 3 persons for participation in the 14th International Film Festival in Moscow in 1985.

Section 17

The Angolan Film Institute will send, and the USSR State Committee for Cinematography will receive, a delegation of Angolan film officials consisting of 3 persons for participation in the 9th International Film Festival of the Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in Tashkent in 1986.

Section 18

In 1985, the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send, and the State Secretariat of Culture of the People's Republic of Angola will receive, two specialists of the All-Union State Soyuzkniga Association to render advisory aid to the Edil firm on book trade organization, for a period of 9 days.

Section 19

The Main Archives Administration of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will receive in 1985 a delegation from the Center for Documentation and Historical Research of the People's Republic of Angola consisting of two persons to become acquainted with the organization of archives and to discuss questions of developing cooperation between archival establishments of the two countries, for a period of 14 days.

Section 20

The Soviet Side (the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) will send in 1985 a delegation consisting of three persons to discuss questions of cooperation with radio and television representatives of the People's Republic of Angola, for a period of 10 days.

Section 21

The Soviet Side (the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) will send in 1985 a political correspondent and a camera-man for filming a television report on the topic "The African Front," for a period of 10 days.

Section 22

The Sides will continue the exchange of documentary, popular science, musical and sports television films, television chronicle materials, and also radio broadcasts about life of the peoples of both countries.

Section 23

On the basis of the Agreement on Principles of Cooperation in Sports, the Sides will promote the exchange of sports delegations, athletes, coaches and other specialists in physical culture and sports.

Section 24

The Sides will further in every way the development of contacts between creative and community organizations of both countries, with the following aims:

1. The Union of Angolan Writers and the USSR Writers Union will exchange delegations of writers in 1985 consisting of 3 persons each for creative get-togethers and for getting acquainted with literary life, for a period of 14 days.

2. The Writers Union of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Union of Angolan Writers will exchange delegations of writers in 1986 consisting of 3 persons each for developing creative contacts, for a period of up to 14 days.

3. The Cinematographers Union of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send to the People's Republic of Angola in 1985 a representative for negotiating cooperation, for a period of 8 days.

4. The Angolan League of Friendship and Solidarity with Peoples will send, and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries will receive, a delegation from the League consisting of three persons from its leadership to participate in the "Angolan Days" in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1985, and a group of Angolan workers consisting of 20 persons to become acquainted with Soviet life, for a period of 14 days.

5. The Angolan League of Friendship and Solidarity with Peoples will send, and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries will receive a delegation of the League consisting of 3 persons to participate in the "Angolan Days" in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1986, and a group of Angolan workers consisting of 20 persons to become acquainted with Soviet life, for a period of 14 days.

6. The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries will send, and the Angolan League of Friendship and Solidarity with Peoples will receive, a delegation from the Minsk City Council consisting of 12 persons to participate in the "Minsk Days" in Luanda in 1985, for a period of 7 days.

7. The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with

Foreign Countries will send, and the Angolan League of Friendship and Solidarity with Peoples will receive, a delegation consisting of 3 persons and a group of amateur entertainers consisting of 20 persons to participate in the "Soviet Union Days" in the People's Republic of Angola in 1986, for a period of 14 days, and also an exhibit of applied arts.

Section 25

The Procuracy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send a delegation consisting of three persons in 1986 for an exchange of experience with organs of the Procurator General of the People's Republic of Angola, for a period of 12 days.

Section 26

The present Protocol does not exclude the adoption of other measure that might be implemented by mutual agreement of interested organizations of both Sides.

Section 27

Financial questions connected with implementing the present Protocol, in the absence of special agreement, will be adjusted on a mutual basis -- more specifically, the sending Side will bear the costs connected with the travel of delegations and separate representatives both ways, while the receiving Side will bear all the costs for their stay in the country.

Done at Luanda on May 22, 1985, in two originals, each in the Russian and Portuguese languages, both texts having equal force.

For the Government of the Union
of Soviet Socialist Republics
A. I. KALININ

For the Government of the
People's Republic of Angola
CARLOS ANTONIO FERNANDES

12962

CSO: 1807/047

SUB/SAHARAN AFRICA

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO MOZAMBIQUE

Moscow FOREIGN TRADE in English No 9, Sep 85 pp 20-23

[Article by Vankarem Zhdankin, executive secretary of the Soviet Side of the Soviet-Mozambique Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Technical Cooperation and Trade: "USSR-Mozambique: Deepening of Trade and Economic Ties"]

[Text]

Interrelations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique from the very first days of the Republic's independence have borne a friendly character and are built on the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty and non-interference in each country's internal affairs.

The Soviet Union is rendering substantial assistance to Mozambique in developing its economy. USSR-Mozambique trade and economic cooperation began in 1976 after the signing of an Agreement on Economic and Technical Cooperation and a Trade Agreement.

Over past years the mechanism of trade and economic cooperation has been perfected and its main trends, objects and forms determined. To realize economic projects and purchase goods the USSR granted Mozambique state and commercial credits on favourable terms.

The Soviet Union is helping Mozambique develop its mining industry, agriculture, the fishing in-

dustry, geology, public health, education, train national specialists, etc. Soviet and Mozambican foreign trade organizations' business contacts have strengthened and the export and import goods range extended due to which the USSR-Mozambique trade turnover increased and a system for maintaining and servicing Soviet machinery and equipment developed.

The setting up of USSR-Mozambique Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Technical Cooperation and Trade in 1980 stemming from the USSR and Mozambique's mutual desire to develop and strengthen their foreign economic ties promoted further the two countries' cooperation.

The first meeting of the Commission held in Moscow, May 1981, discussed important questions of Soviet-Mozambican trade and economic cooperation. In the course of the meeting the USSR-Mozambique Long-term Programme for Economic and Trade Cooperation for 1981-1990 was

signed. The decisions and recommendations adopted at the second meeting of the Commission (November 1981) specified the main directions in the spheres of economic and technical cooperation on the basis of the Long-term Programme.

At present both sides place great stress on organizing coal mining at the Moatize coal field (Tete province). The All-Union Association Tsvetmetpromexport is giving the necessary technical assistance for opening two coal mines and exploiting two open-cast collieries (total output up to five million tons of coal per year). Kuzbassgiproshakht, a leading Soviet design institute, is responsible for these coal extractive projects. Of great importance for the Moatize coal field's development is a general scheme being worked out by this institute. Soviet geologists are prospecting at this coal field to determine the possible reserves of particular coal horizons for their commercial exploitation.

Soviet organizations are maintaining close business contacts with the state organization Magma dealing with the operation and modernization of the Morrua enterprise processing pegmatite ores. A new enrichment enterprise whose design is soon to be completed by the Soviet Giredmet design institute and which will be constructed at this coal-field with Soviet assistance will double the present productive capacities.

In September 1984 Soviet specialists completed a general scheme for the Limpopo valley's water utilization and agricultural development. The All-Union Association Selkhozpromexport jointly with the State Secretariat for development of the Limpopo-Inkomati

(SERLI) basin completed a large volume of prospecting and research which assessed the Limpopo valley's land resources (total area nearly 80,000 sq km). From the recommendations given in the general scheme Mozambican organizations can, on a scientific basis, develop new agricultural lands and those being used, form collective farms and introduce progressive agricultural land cultivation methods.

A feasibility study on advisability of rehabilitating the Baixo-Limpopo state farm's agricultural production has been fulfilled. Drilling wells for water in the Gaza province to supply cooperative villages and populated areas with water is being successfully carried out.

Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic's specialized organizations are comprehensively supplying assistance for cotton to be grown in the Nampula province by the Methochiria, Mezerepane and Netia state farms.

Jointly with Mozambique's Ministry of Agriculture questions on setting up three experimental stations specializing in processing and manufacturing agricultural produce in the Limpopo valley and two shops for repairing tractors and other agricultural machinery are under study.

Cooperation in fishery is deepening year by year. The activity of the Soviet-Mozambican mixed fishing company Mosopesca is successfully forging ahead. Soviet-made ships are operated by joint crews. The All-Union Association Prommashexport is supplying three SRTM-502E fishing trawlers on favourable terms, two of them are already fishing in Mozambique's coastal waters. There are good cooperation prospects in

this sector. Under the USSR-Mozambique Agreement on developing fishery signed during the 8th session of the Soviet-Mozambican Joint Commission on Fishery (August 1984) the USSR will augment Mozambique's fishing fleet through supplying fishing trawlers and also develop coastal fishery and fishery cooperative farms.

In 1982 technical assistance was rendered in constructing a ship repair complex in Maputo port comprising a floating dock (dead-weight capacity 4,500 tons) and a floating repair shop supplied by the USSR. Now Mozambique can service and repair not only its own but also other countries' fishing vessels which gives the country additional currency earnings.

The training of national specialists, an important feature of Soviet-Mozambican cooperation, has further advanced. With the Soviet Union's technical assistance five vocational schools and a pedagogical technical school were equipped and opened. Assistance rendered in setting up and equipping four vocational technical schools and a polytechnical school in Beira was a new step in this direction. In line with the Protocol on Cultural and Scientific Cooperation a large group of Soviet teachers and instructors is working in Mozambique's educational establishments and elementary schools.

There are substantial positive shifts in the USSR-Mozambique's trade relations which is evident from the annual trade turnover growth. Ways for the further expansion of export-import operations are being studied.

The USSR-Mozambique Intergovernmental Commission for

Economic and Technical Cooperation and Trade became an effective body constantly improving the two countries' trade relations. Over the period of its functioning the USSR-Mozambique's trade turnover has increased several times and in 1984 reached 137.5 million rubles. The Soviet Union exports machinery, equipment, petroleum products, fresh-frozen fish, books and other publications, etc. to Mozambique buying there metallic ores, concentrates, nuts, etc. Soviet foreign trade organizations annually participate in the international Fair FACIM held in Maputo.

The third meeting of the Commission was held in Moscow, April 1985. P. Ya. Koshelev, Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, was the head of the Soviet delegation and Mário da Graça Machungo, Minister of Planning of the People's Republic of Mozambique, of the Mozambican delegation.

The meeting considered matters concerning the state and prospects of the USSR-Mozambique's trade and economic cooperation. The Commission expressed satisfaction with the results attained in the Soviet-Mozambican economic and trade cooperation.

Both delegations stressed the great importance of the tasks envisaged in the USSR-Mozambique Long-term Programme of Economic and Trade Cooperation for 1981-1990 and exchanged opinions on their realization. Fulfilment of Soviet and Mozambican organization's commitments under the present agreements on economic and technical cooperation and trade was also discussed.

The sides evinced readiness to

develop Soviet-Mozambican cooperation in the economic and trade spheres and outlined further steps that would deepen this cooperation.

M. Machungo, head of the Mozambican delegation, had meetings with M. A. Sergeichik, Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; P. A. Paskar, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; G. K. Zhuravlev, First Deputy Foreign Trade Minister, and others.

In the course of the Commission's work talks were held between the Mozambican delegation and representatives of the All-Union Associations Tsvetmetpromexport, Selkhozpromexport, Technoexport, Technostroyexport and Prommashexport and also representatives of Soviet foreign trade organizations.

During the meeting protocols on rendering Mozambique assistance in the mining industry, transport, civil engineering and fishing were signed to supplement the USSR-Mozambique Agreement on Development of Economic and Technical Cooperation.

In line with the signed documents Soviet organizations will give technical assistance in constructing a coal dressing en-

terprise at the Moatize coal-field, in creating an infrastructure for the open-cast collieries being developed by Soviet organizations as well as a workshop for repairing mining equipment. Soviet organizations will participate in reconstructing the Beira port-Moatize railway and will continue with their commitments on design and research work. Owing to the construction of these projects Mozambique will be able to export coal from the Moatize coal-field. In the construction industry Soviet organizations will help strengthen Mozambique's building organization by supplying equipment and sending Soviet specialists. This organization will carry out construction work at the projects being erected with the USSR's technical assistance. Cooperation in fishery is progressing.

M. Machungo, Chairman of Mozambique's part of the Commission, emphasized that the meeting was another step towards consolidating the USSR-Mozambique's friendship and cooperation, and the signed intergovernmental documents witnessed that the Soviet Union was continuing rendering its great assistance to the Mozambican people in developing their national economy in the present difficult period for the People's Republic of Mozambique.

COPYRIGHT: "Vneshnyaya torgovlya" 1985
English translation, "Foreign Trade", 1985

/9274

CSO: 1812/36

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

7 January 1986

A black rectangular redaction mark covering text in the bottom right corner of the page.